

THE
METHODIST MAGAZINE
AND
Quarterly Review.

EDITED BY S. LUCKEY AND G. COLES.

VOL. XX, No. 4.

OCTOBER, 1838. NEW SERIES—VOL. IX, No. 4.

For the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review.

ART. I.—SKETCHES OF SOUTH AMERICA.

BY REV. J. DEMPSTER, A. M., MISSIONARY AT BUENOS AYRES.

[Continued from page 264.]

NO. II.

HAVING accomplished, in No. I, what we proposed on the *geography* of Spanish South America, we shall now dismiss this topic until the other subjects proposed in our plan shall have received a proper attention, and then resume this, when the Brazilian empire shall come under our notice. In accordance with our previous arrangements, the present No. will be devoted to the *aborigines* of the new world south of the northern temperate zone. From what countries of the old world these ancient tribes emigrated is a question whose solution must baffle the skill of the ablest antiquarian. So dense is the darkness that rests on that distant event, and so deep is the silence of even traditional records, that the inquirer has no guide to lead him even to probability on the subject. But that the hundreds of nations found in the new world never originated in the same section of the eastern hemisphere, and that they could not have emigrated at the same period to the western hemisphere, very strong probabilities concur to prove. That some of these nations came to America at a very remote antiquity appears from their having been without the knowledge of many of those arts which were known, both in Europe and Asia, centuries before the Christian era, and without many of those conveniences of life which, when once known, could scarcely ever be forgotten. Among many of these may be instanced the use of wax and oil for light. This may also be inferred from the facts, that some of these nations preserved in their traditions and paintings the memory of the creation of the world—of the building of the tower of Babel—of the confusion of languages—and of the dispersion of the people, but had no knowledge of the most marked events that have since occurred in Europe, Asia, or Africa, though many of those events once known are of such a character that the knowledge of them could never have been entirely lost; while that of earlier events was retained. Nor was there among the earliest nations of America any knowledge of the inhabitants of the old continent, or the least trace there

of their passage to this. From these and kindred considerations it appears that the first emigrations occurred at a subsequent period, not very remote from the dispersion from Babel. Nor is it less evident that some of these nations came to America at much later periods. Evidence of this is furnished by physical facts, American paintings, and historical documents. The vast number and astonishing variety of aboriginal languages could never consist with that *identity* of origin, and period of emigration, which have so often been ascribed to the Americans. By languages are not intended merely those various dialects and idioms with which the new world abounds: of these many hundreds have been recorded: * but languages which have no more affinity than the eastern and western languages of the old world, which are most dissimilar. As grammars and lexicons have been formed of more than twenty native languages, it is ascertained with the utmost certainty that there are five languages in Mexico, and more than twice that number in South America, which are as radically different as the Latin and the Hebrew, and therefore could never have originated in the same nation. Philological learning has for three centuries exhausted all its resources to find points of resemblance between these ancient languages; but the result has been a complete failure. It has also sought, with the greatest patience and labor, for some likeness between the oldest of these languages and any of those known in Europe, Asia, and Africa; but not a feature of resemblance is discernible. As, then, these languages nowhere exist in the world, the nations that used them must have long since disappeared from the families of the earth. The new world has afforded a refuge to the remnants of those nations of the old world whom war and revolution have consigned to oblivion. The striking *contrast* between many languages of America proves the tribes to have had a very various origin. Some of these are poor and inexpressive to an extent that would adapt them only to savage life. Others are copious and forcible beyond several of the polished languages of Europe. The inadequacy of the former to express any complex idea with precision, or communicate any sentiment with vigor—to clothe any general ideas, or to furnish terms for the most simple principles of science, proves it to have originated in very remote antiquity, or at least to have continued in use for many ages in the lowest and most uncivilized state of society. On the other hand, the rich and powerful languages used by several nations of America direct us to seek their origin in far more cultivated nations, and their emigration to the woods of America at much later periods. It is true, that the fact of any of these Indian languages being copious and refined has been denied by authors of some name. At the head of these is found M. De Paw, a Prussian philosopher, who, though he was never nearer South America than the city of Berlin, speculates and dogmatizes on the native Americans as though he had been born in their country, and had mingled with their tribes. He positively affirms that "in no one of these languages can they count more than three; that it is impossible to translate a book into the Mexican or the Peruvian language, because of their great deficiency in terms to express general ideas." Dr. Robertson, who evidently derived

* Of these fifteen hundred have been counted south of the north temperate zone.

many of his materials from such philosophical speculations on the new world, has been led to the most erroneous conclusions on this and kindred matters. But with regard to their numeral terms, the most ample evidence is adducible to refute that groundless assertion. A highly qualified historian, distinguished for his scrupulous accuracy,* who has long resided in Spanish America, and made deep researches into the antiquities of that country, gives us the ancient Mexican terms by which they counted from a unit to forty-eight millions, and those by which they could ascend to any assignable number. The same accomplished author shows with equal clearness that directly the reverse of the alleged poverty of the Mexican language is true. He shows from his personal knowledge of that language that it possesses a rich variety of terms both for moral and metaphysical subjects; and after carefully comparing it with the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, Italian, and Spanish, he concludes that in abstract terms it far exceeds any of those languages. Indeed, from the specimen he gives us of this class of their words, it appears that there is scarcely an operation of the human mind, or a known attribute of the infinite Creator, for which the Mexican language does not supply a term. No European has deeply studied this native language without eulogizing it as admirably adapted to express the most delicate sensations of the heart and the loftiest emotions of the mind. These opposite characters in the Indian languages are not peculiar to those of Mexico, but have been observed in numerous parts of South America. Of these our limits will permit us to notice only a single instance in Peru. The early inhabitants of that empire used the Guichua language, which was radically unlike that of the incarial race. So total was the dissimilarity of the languages of these two nations that those who perfectly understood one had not the least knowledge of the other. Indeed, a knowledge of the language used by the incas was confined entirely to the royal family. No subject in this vast empire, not even the nobles themselves, was permitted to become acquainted with it. So entirely was it diverse from the ancient language of the empire that messages were transmitted in it, *viva voce*, by persons stationed at intervals to the extremities of the country. Thus all the councils of the monarch were matured and communicated to any section of the empire in a state of secrecy deep as the *arcana* of the future. None but the royal family could suspect his plans till they burst into execution. Though this language was lost in less than two ages after the Spanish conquest, it survived the fall of the incarial throne long enough to be examined and found far superior to the ancient language of Peru, both in force and copiousness. All the *traditions* of the Peruvians entirely accord with the inference flowing from this contrast in the two languages. The following may be given as an epitome of these traditional records of the origin of that race that so long governed them. About twelve generations anterior to the Spanish invasion there appeared in Peru two extraordinary personages by the names of Manco Capac and Mama Oollo. Their complexion was fair, their appearance majestic, and their apparel was cotton garments of the most glittering white. They claimed to be children of the sun, whom that beneficent parent of our race had sent, in his deep commiseration for the miseries of

* Clavigero.

mankind. But this claim to divinity, so common to ancient heroes and lawgivers, was not at first accorded to these offspring of the sun. The following were some of the peculiar circumstances under which this claim was made by these pretenders, and finally conceded by the natives:—These two descendants from the orb of day were the son and daughter of a white man who had come to the cacique of that country, become his son-in-law, and taught to these his only two children many of the useful arts till then totally unknown in Peru. After the death of this stranger, the father-in-law, determining to *deify* his family, placed his grandson on a mountain overhanging the densely peopled valley of Cusco, assembled the natives, and declared to them that their god, the sun, had taken pity on them, and sent two of his children to govern them; that they would find these celestial personages on the summit of the mountain; and as an attestation of his statement, they should find the color of their hair like that of the sunbeams. But the people, believing that the light hair and fair countenance of these youth were the effects of witchcraft, banished them to the valley of Rimac. The cacique, persisting in his purpose to deify his posterity, removed his golden-haired grandchildren from the place of their exile to the Island of Titicaca, whose inhabitants were of an easier faith. He then caused the young man to assemble those islanders, and return at their head to Cusco. Those who first banished this bright-faced stranger, now seeing him at the head of so powerful a force, quietly submitted to his claim, and proclaimed him their inca. To all acquainted with the history of Peru it is well known that *inca* is an official name, by which regal authority was implied, and that the monarchs of that dynasty had *Capac* or *Manco Capac* for their common name. Etymologists attempt, in a plausible manner, to account for the origin and application of this name. They inform us that when the father of the first inca was asked by the cacique who he was, he answered, *Englishman*, which, in the Guichua language, was pronounced *ingas-man*, to which was added *Cocapac*, (blooming,) expressive of the fair complexion of the European stranger; which united was *Ingas-man Cocapac*, from which came the three words, *Inca*, *Manco*, *Capac*. To dispose of the probabilities against an Englishman's having been cast on this shore of the new world more than eight hundred years ago, we leave entirely to antiquarians. But whether or not the manner how, and the period when, the incarial race entered America are here correctly stated, nothing can be more indubitable than that the period of their arrival at this continent was many centuries later than that at which the first inhabitants of Peru made their appearance. The cultivated state of the arts, and the deeply concerted system of government introduced by this race into Peru, prove no less than the superiority of its now lost language that it was not a wandering tribe of the American woods, but a portion of some civilized nation of the eastern continent. Cusco was the seat of empire under the reign of this powerful dynasty. The shattered remains of this once splendid empire still exhibit some of the most exquisite works of art. Such are especially found in the historical descriptions of this city at the period of its capture. Among many others may be instanced the most curious ornaments of gold and silver which were numerously placed in the royal garden. Some of these were gigantic representations of flowers and shrubs,

containing incredible quantities of the precious metals, and exhibiting a skill in the artists which designed and manufactured them that never belonged to a race of barbarians. Those gold and silver bushes of these burnished metals so filled the area with the glory of their reflected splendor as to give the whole scene an unearthly aspect. Of the architectural skill of this mysterious people some of the most magnificent monuments have disappeared since the Spanish conquest. A relic of them, however, appears in the remains of the ancient temple of the sun. The inconsiderable portion of its walls which remains—on which a most splendid convent has been built—indicates the exquisite art by which the vast superstructure was erected. The chambers of this spacious building, which, in the times of the incas, were occupied by the virgins of the sun, would have vied with some of the finest models of Grecian architecture. But the most remarkable monument of the perfection to which this art was carried in Peru is found in the ruins of a gigantic fortress, portions of whose walls are still in a state of perfect preservation. The stones which form these walls are of amazing magnitude, of polygonal shapes, and of various dimensions. They were placed together in massive walls, without any kind of cement; yet, notwithstanding their numerous angles and various dimensions, with such surprising nicety was this done as to preclude the insertion of a needle between them. How the Peruvians conveyed to the spot these enormous masses, and raised them to such heights in those lofty walls; how they fitted those amazing blocks of numerous corners and diversified dimensions with such minute precision, are still arcana which European acuteness has never yet penetrated. These and other monuments in Cusco, which have survived the destructive barbarism of its more than Vandal conquerors, attest the civilization and power of the incarial dynasty.

Nor was the superiority of this race less evinced by the depth of policy which existed in the system of its government. Though this government was a pure despotism, it was so ingeniously modified by patriarchal customs and institutions that the authority of the monarch was enthroned both in the fear and affections of his subjects. On a few simple principles was based the vast system of jurisprudence by which the empire was governed. Among the most prominent of those were these three precepts:—Am sua, ama qualla, ama llulla, (i. e., Thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not lie, thou shalt not be idle.) The produce of agriculture was enjoyed in common. All the fruits of the earth were divided into four equal parts by officers to whom that important apportionment was committed. One quarter of the whole was devoted to the support of the widow, the orphan, and the helpless. Another was applied to the support of religion, from which means were derived to erect temples, to sustain the priesthood and that numerous train of women called the virgins of the sun. The third quarter was enjoyed by the community at large, to whose various parts it was distributed with the utmost care and impartiality; and the fourth part maintained in more than regal splendor the inca and his wide-spread family, though in the lapse of successive ages this became exceedingly numerous. Like the Spartans, this people never used gold and silver as money. As ornaments these precious metals abounded among the higher classes of the Peruvian nation; but as a circu-

lating medium they were never known here until European invaders laid the incarial power in the dust. Another marked trait in the Peruvian policy appears in the arrangements made by that government for the aggrandizement and extending influence of the capital, and also to secure the subordination of the influential class of citizens to the extremities of the empire. Every nation that successively bowed to the sway of incarial power was permitted to add a new division to the city, so that whatever portion of each nation might choose to reside in it for political, commercial, or other purposes, it could retain its usages, costume, and all its other distinctive characteristics. Hence the capital not only exhibited that striking variety which existed in all the nations of that vast empire, but possessing a part of each nation, it held a kind of security for the loyalty of all. The government also required that the sons of certain superior classes, in every part of the empire, should reside at the capital until their education was finished. These youth, thus becoming deeply imbued with the principles of government, and strongly attached to its leading functionaries about the throne, were admirably qualified to countenance and perpetuate the royal authority in the various provinces to which they should return. And as these were continually, in great numbers, near the centre of absolute power, they were a sufficient pledge for the good conduct of their parents, whose rank would have given an alarming character to any treasonable design they might have otherwise formed. Thus was accomplished the double purpose of giving the best qualifications to officers, to the very limits of the empire, and of furnishing the best security against revolt. Indeed, none can so acquaint himself with the ancient system of Peruvian government as to perceive the depth and combination of the various parts of its policy without feeling compelled to seek its origin in a social state very different from that of savages. Nor was this political system merely a stupendous fabric in *theory*. It was mighty in its practical power. Such was the stable control it held over millions that not a single intestine broil disturbed the tranquillity of the state during the ten long successive reigns. By so steady a hand was *tempered* justice administered that not a page of Peruvian history was stained with blood until the eleventh inca ascended the throne, immediately anterior to the Spanish invasion. All their wars during the successive centuries of the incarial dominion, by which numerous neighboring tribes were made to bow to that sway, were waged in equity, and terminated without savage cruelty; and in some instances the sole condition required by the conqueror was, that the vanquished should abandon *their idols*, and worship the sun. Now where on the whole globe can there be found a greater contrast between two nations than that which appears in the social state of the ancient inhabitants of Peru and in the state of that later race which mysteriously entered among them? Those aboriginal tribes, up to the time of the incas, were in the lowest state of savage degradation. Their dwelling places were holes and caves in the mountains. Their food was not the product of the soil, but—excepting human flesh—the game of the woods, the fish of their streams, and the wild roots, fruits, and berries of the forest. Those who were not in a state of entire nudity covered themselves with the undressed skins of the beasts they caught. But the most horrifying feature in their savage character

was their cannibalism. They did not content themselves with imitating the Mexicans, who feasted on the human flesh offered to their gods, or other tribes who made their prisoners of war the meat of their table; but they fed and fattened their *own children* that they might butcher them, like swine, and feed on their bloody corpses. But no sooner had the incarial family entered Peru, and acquired authority, than these shocking atrocities vanished from the country. Those dismal caverns, fit only for ferocious beasts, were exchanged for habitations erected for man; agriculture took the place of hunting; the undressed skins of wild beasts were exchanged for cotton garments; simple homage to the sun succeeded the sacrifice of their offspring to that imaginary deity; and the horrid practice of butchering their children for common meals soon existed nowhere but in the records of the past. Surely a change so speedy and felicitous, which has turned wild wastes into fruitful fields, and ferocious cannibals into intelligent agriculturists, could only be effected by a race of greatly superior intelligence. Now the fact that the *native Americans* originated in various nations in the eastern hemisphere, and emigrated at very different periods to the new world, is made evident by the Mexican paintings and several other historical documents. The hieroglyphical tables of the ancient Astics have transmitted to us the principal epochs of the great emigrations toward the south. According to these records, these occurred between the sixth and thirteenth centuries. The thinly peopled valley of Mexico was invaded by the Taultecs in 648, about two centuries later than that great rush took place from the north into the populous and civilized regions of Europe. But while this latter invasion plunged millions of civilized men into the long night of barbarism that shaded the middle ages, that of Mexico shed the first light of civilization on those wandering hordes which had roamed for ages in the desert. At different periods of the twelfth century four other nations successively entered Mexico. These were the Chichimecks, the Nahuatlucks, the Acolhues, and the Astics, who all evidently flowed from the north, and great portions of whom passed on south of that delightful valley, about which so many of them took up their residence. An author, distinguished for the depth of his researches into the origin of ancient nations, has adduced Chinese annals to show that America was visited by that nation posterior to the middle of the fifth century; and the ingenious Horne, with several later writers of deserved celebrity, collected historical evidence of great strength to prove that *old relations* existed between Asia and America; and the considerations urged by Count Humboldt, that most distinguished traveler, go far toward proving that the Taultecs or Astics were a part of the Hiongnoux, who, according to the Chinese historians, emigrated under Punon, their leader, and were lost in the northern part of Siberia. This fierce nation of warlike shepherds had more than once changed the political face of oriental Asia, and in an early age, under the name of Huns, it desolated the fairest portions of civilized Europe. Though there are the most indubitable evidences that all those nations which emigrated to the tropical parts of America after the sixth century traveled from the north, there is not a single remaining trace by which to determine from what direction those earliest tribes came which had dwelt there for many generations. The place of their origin, the route they

traveled, and the time of their arrival, are covered with the impenetrable gloom of unrecorded ages. Would our limits allow of so much minuteness it might be convincingly shown by *osteology* that all the American tribes never sprang from the Mongol or any other *one* race; but that some of them owe their origin to people who have long since been blotted out from national existence. And we learn by various indications that the earliest tribes in this part of the new world were of extremely remote antiquity, that some of the most ancient of them have even become extinct. Reference can now be had to only one of these. In Mexican paintings still preserved are human figures of enormous aquiline noses. No people has been known of such features to exist in America for many past centuries. This race must therefore have, many ages since, sunk in oblivion. Those who entered the tropical regions after the sixth century must have emigrated from the old world at a much later period than those wild hordes that bowed to their superior discipline. Their knowledge of the arts and sciences leaves this unquestionable. In agriculture and horticulture they excelled. They made extensive dikes, excavated great canals, erected magnificent bridges, and possessed the art of founding metals, and of cutting and giving the highest polish to the hardest stones. They erected those huge pyramids the largest of which measured on one side of the base more than fourteen hundred feet. The perfect manner in which they prepared the material for their hieroglyphics, and the extensive scale on which it was formed, were unequalled by any ancient nation of the eastern world. This, which was argave paper, or stag skin, was often seventy-two feet in length. It was folded here and there, in the form of a rhomb, and thin boards, fastened to the extremities, formed their binding, and gave them a resemblance to our books in quarto. Their hierarchy was formed on principles which so combined the civil, military, and clerical functionaries as to prove that a system so complicated, and so well adjusted, must have been preceded by a long series of political experiments which could never have been made in that immense wilderness of the new world. These, and kindred facts which speak the same language, uttered by historical intimations and hieroglyphical paintings, bring us irresistibly to the conclusion, that all those arduous attempts which have been made to prove the natives of America to be the descendants of *Israel*, or of the *Mongol* race, or of any other *one* nation on the globe, have issued in a total failure. So deep is the darkness which rests on these earliest wanderers through the American deserts, that the profoundest researches must leave their origin still in the region of mystery. Every light expires long before the time of their emigration to the western continent can be reached. Indeed, the nations of which they were a part, the land of their forefathers, the route and period of their emigration, are among those millions of human events which have never found a place on the historian's page, and lie too deep beneath the lumber of ages ever to be called from oblivion.

The number of the natives at the time of the *discovery* cannot without emotion be compared to the number at present in existence. The whole copper-colored race now in being in both Americas cannot exceed six millions. This remnant, scattered over that vast territory which enters the perpetual snow of the north, and reaches

to Cape Horn in the south, was once more than equalled by the ancient inhabitants of Peru alone. The causes of this mournful decrease will claim attention when the *colonial system* shall come under our notice. It is true, that the fact of these countries ever having been populous has been a debated question. The most respectable of those who deny it is Baron Humboldt. He states that in 1575 there were no more than one million and a half in Peru. But it now appears that the records on which he based his statement contemplated merely the taxable males from eighteen to fifty years of age; and that from an actual census taken near that period, not less than eight millions two hundred and eighty thousand then existed within the ancient Peruvian empire. Now if to these we add the vast numbers that perished at the conquest, and in the desolating wars that wasted them by hundreds of thousands during the first half century subsequent to the Spanish invasion, the Peruvians under their last inca must have amounted to at least *ten millions*. That they were very numerous appears also from the ancient and extensive ruins found scattered over their country. Among these are found the remains of some large cities capable of a hundred thousand inhabitants, located where rain never falls, and more than twenty miles from a single drop of water. These could have obtained water only by driving shafts horizontally into the mountain, at an immense expense of labor. Indeed, by this means they fertilized some of the most sterile regions which glow beneath a tropical sun. As a striking instance of this, many refer to the valley of Nasca, which depends exclusively on water thus obtained. This ever verdant plain, hemmed in by a wilderness of fifty miles' extent, must have frowned in the gloom of everlasting sterility but for these subterraneous passages, through which streams have gushed for many past ages. That labor by which this soil could be so enriched for centuries as to produce vines of a diameter equal to the trunk of a tree with the growth of thirty years would never have been bestowed by a sparse population. Now as such instances were numerous, they not merely proved the nation possessing incredible enterprise, but consisting of vast numbers. The fact that during the latter ages of their national existence they never located a city, built a hamlet, or erected a dwelling on an arable spot, also indicates the density of their population. Indeed, it is not credible that an inconsiderable population, scattered over an immense territory, would build those extensive cities, and at so vast an expense fertilize those sterile plains, when the extensive regions of productive land were more than sufficient to sustain *such* a population. In what is called the kingdom of the Zac, now embraced in the republic of Colombia, several monumental evidences still remain of the populousness of these ancient seats of American empire. The early records of Mexico authorize a similar conclusion with regard to the natives of that ancient empire. Cortez, who subverted for ever the throne of Montezuma, states in his letter to Charles V. that the natives who assisted him in the siege of Mexico amounted to more than two hundred thousand; and that the number of the besieged who perished during their resistance exceeded one hundred and fifty thousand. The facts recorded by an eye witness of the scene when the city was captured are strongly corroborative of other historical accounts of the populousness of Mexico. He states that

all the inhabitants of the city at its surrender, being commanded to leave it, filled the streets and roads at their egress three days and nights, so great was the multitude notwithstanding all that had previously perished. And several of the most accurate historians of the sixteenth century describe above forty large cities, exclusive of numerous villages and hamlets, which were scattered over Mexico when the Spaniards invaded it. Entirely accordant with these historical notices are the ecclesiastical records of the same age. According to these, not less than six millions of the natives were baptized during the sixteen years immediately succeeding 1524, by the Franciscans alone, exclusive of all those baptized by the Dominicans and Augustinians, and also exclusive of vast multitudes who refused to receive that ordinance. During the same century more than two millions perished by the small pox and two other epidemics which were dreadfully mortal. There exists the most abundant evidence that when the Europeans entered the new world, its numerous nations were engaged in the most bloody and exterminating conflicts. Several tribes had recently become extinct, and others were rapidly disappearing. How long these mutual slayers had continued, there remain no data by which to determine; but it is highly probable that hundreds of thousands in the fifteenth century sank in the field of blood along the extended range of mutual conflict. But after all this fearful havoc of the aborigines, they remained exceedingly numerous at the time of the conquest. In the Brazilian empire alone there were found not less than four hundred native tribes; and if the entire agreement of several historians makes the highest claims on our confidence, there can be no doubt but they amounted to at least two millions. Though the ancient kingdom of the Zac, the rich valley of Mexico, and the extensive empire of Peru, were far the most densely populated portions of the new world, they did not contain all its inhabitants. There were even millions sparsely scattered over the wintry regions of Patagonia, along the verdant banks of the Amazon, and over the woodless plains of the La Plata. By these and many kindred historical facts the conclusion is fully authorized that in the fifteenth century there could not have been less than twenty millions of Indians south of the northern temperate zone.

N. B. The remaining part of this No. will be communicated in my next.

JOHN DEMPSTER.

Buenos Ayres, January 20, 1838.

For the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review.

ART. II.—ON PASTORAL VISITING.

THE following remarks are more particularly applicable to junior preachers, and as such respectfully addressed to them. The agency which stands forth as at once the most important and responsible in the world is beyond all question the gospel ministry. If there be any thing calculated to lead to fidelity in motives of the highest character and the widest range, then may we expect it in those to whom is committed the ministry of reconciliation, and who stand in the high character of *ambassadors for God*. Their work is the

most sacred, their vows are the most solemn, their success is the most glorious, and their failures the most awful; and as for themselves, as individuals, "their stake is for a higher heaven or a deeper hell." Well may we exclaim, in reference to such a work, "Who is sufficient for these things?" and well may we expect God's chosen instruments will be "cautious, diffident, and slow," in entering upon it. This work, at once so glorious and so awful, divides itself into two distinct branches, public preaching and pastoral labor; and the apostle has given an excellent summary of ministerial duty in affirming what he himself had done: "I have taught you *publicly and from house to house.*" To the latter of these divisions of the work I desire to invite the attention of the junior members of the ministry in the Methodist Episcopal Church. The necessity of keeping alive so important a subject is my only apology, and I proceed,

I. To notice the necessity and advantages of faithful pastoral labor, particularly visiting from house to house.

1. The first reason I shall offer for the necessity of prompt and faithful pastoral labor is one growing out of the fact that our ministry is itinerant. The connection between pastor and people, *at the best, must be sufficiently slight* where a regular change takes place once in two years. If, therefore, a minister who goes to serve a particular congregation, which he must leave in two years, and may leave in one, delay the commencement of his pastoral work, or if, indeed, he does not begin at once, and prosecute it with diligence, he will be called away before a proper pastoral connection is even formed at all. From the people of his charge he will go as he came, a stranger, or at best be known to them but as a preacher; and he will leave a flock over whom "the Holy Ghost had made him overseer," and to whom this most weighty charge had been given, "Take heed therefore unto [thyself] and to all the flock," with the sin of guilty omission upon his head.

2. Pastoral visiting is essential to a minister's influence. There may be a few, very few exceptions to this remark. There may be persons who, by a combination of rare pulpit abilities, gain and maintain considerable ministerial influence without performing much pastoral labor. But such instances will be rare. And even such preachers (ministers they should not be called) are far less influential and useful than they might be did they follow the example of the very first of ministers, the Apostle Paul, and teach not only "publicly, but from house to house." The influence of ministers is generally in proportion to the interest which they show for the souls committed to their care. It is an influence which is gained by watching with interest over the spiritual condition of each member of the flock—an influence acquired by the fireside, in the parlor, and at the bed of sickness. An affectionate solicitude for souls manifested by looking after the aged and infirm, by counseling the tempted, solving the difficulties of the perplexed, instructing the inquiring, encouraging the desponding, and exercising a parental care and kind regard for the young and inexperienced—this is what makes the sight of a faithful pastor welcome as the visits of an angel of mercy, and gives him a sway over his people which adds double weight to every word dropping from his lips in his pulpit exercises.

3. Pastoral visiting is a most efficient agency in keeping up and increasing an attendance on public and social religious exercises.

A visit from a pastor is generally considered as expressive of his solicitude for the welfare of those he visits. It is taken as a token of his interest in the people of his charge. Now it is a law of human nature that interest should be reciprocal. We are interested for those who are interested for us. Love is the loan for love. True, sin may often be found to contravene every law of nature; and such is the opposition of the human heart to religion that men sometimes affect to consider those their enemies who tell them the truth, and endeavor to do them good. Yet it is equally true that even such persons will reproach the man who neglects them, and will be much more likely to be found in the house of God on the Sabbath, if they have received an affectionate pastoral visit during the week. The very sight of a pastor coming to inquire after the condition of his people awakens in their minds a sense of obligation to attend on his ministry, the fruits of which you will often discover in the excuses which seem spontaneously to be called up if they have been absent for any length of time from the house of God. But if a pastor neglect his people, a sort of estrangement grows up between them. They feel the neglect as a kind of indignity, and are disposed to repay him in his own coin. There is a feeling which, if clothed in language, would say, "It is well enough for you to preach to empty walls who neglect to look after your people."

4. In pastoral visiting the best materials are gained for the pulpit. Without freely mingling with the people of his charge, it is difficult, if not impossible, for a minister to adapt his preaching to the state of his hearers. One great reason why sermons are often heard without interest is because of their deficiency in practical adaptation to the wants of the hearers. The matter, however excellent in itself, is out of place. It does not touch the point. Let a minister closet himself up in his library from month to month, or keep aloof from his people from one end of the year to the other, and there is no community of feeling between them. He dwells in another region; his thoughts flow in another channel; and when he enters the pulpit perchance he succeeds in interesting himself, while those who should be his hearers go to sleep. On the contrary, the man who freely associates with his people becomes acquainted with their wants, their prepossessions, and their modes of thinking. He learns the obstacles which stand opposed to his success; discovers the favorable omens that appear; sees the image of his own labors reflected back upon himself, so that he may remedy defects or pursue his successes. In short, he becomes more and more a practical man, while at the same time he has far more variety than he could possibly gather from any other field than the interesting field of human nature, which his pastoral visits have led him daily to explore. "You must recommend this [pastoral visiting] to Henry, [his son,]" said the incomparable Legh Richmond, "as the very best preparation for the ministry. Try, my dear F., to keep him up to it. Tell him his poor father learned his most valuable lessons for the ministry, and his most useful experience in religion, in the poor man's cottage."

5. Pastoral visiting may be considered the practical application of pulpit discourses. In thousands of instances we cannot bring important truths to an individual bearing, and a practical result, by any other means than following our hearers home. An impression

may have been made, but it may be still faint. Conviction may in part be produced, but some difficulty may be still in the way which can only be learned and removed by a personal interview; or if the seed be fairly sown, there may be many fowls of the air ready to devour it. It may even have already sprung up, but the thorns may have arisen also to choke and render it unfruitful, unless the skilful husbandman arrive in season to root them out. Let any faithful minister set down the number of cases that occur in even two or three years where pastoral efforts have been the means of removing formidable difficulties—where persons had, to all appearance, come to a crisis, and were trembling in the balances between life and death, and the scale has been turned; or when they have been brought under some powerful temptation which has been removed, or when they had backslidden and have been reclaimed, or where convictions have been brought to result in conversion—where, in one word, a principal instrumentality in saving a soul was pastoral visiting, and it is apprehended he will be astonished at the result.

6. Pastoral visiting is indispensable to gathering the fruits of a revival, and discharging the duties due to young Christians. When God has made a minister instrumental in the conversion of a soul, it is, without doubt, the duty of that minister to watch over that soul as one that must give account. That soul is eminently one over whom the Holy Ghost has made *him* overseer. It is no work of proselytism for a minister to look after that soul, and gather the fruits of his own labors. There is an obligation resting upon him to do so—an obligation from which he can be free only when that person voluntarily leaves his pastoral care, or when he himself removes to another field of labor, or an unavoidable separation takes place. For want of proper effort in taking care of those God has given us, we have been oftentimes bereaved of our children, and many, very many, awakened and converted to God in Methodist churches, and who are to this day Methodists in sentiment, are gathered into other churches, while scarce a person of another faith is to be found in our churches. If persons who are converted among us change their sentiments uninfluenced, and leave us for conscience' sake, we have no reason to complain; but where they still continue one with us in sentiment, and yet are taken from us, verily there is a great fault somewhere. Now is it not a fact that our ministry is much more successful in the awakening and conversion of souls than in nurturing them after they are converted? Is it not a fact that, through culpable negligence, we have allowed many to be alienated from us, while we have also, from the same cause, allowed many to backslide from God, who, with faithful watch-care, might have now been useful members of the church? The apostle has appropriately likened the young Christian to a little child; and how much care and effort is required for raising a little child to maturity, yea, and how many would perish without that care, and how culpable would those be deemed who were guilty of the neglect through which they perished? And can Christian ministers, to whom God has given the especial charge of those converted under their ministry, be otherwise than highly culpable if they refuse to exercise that care which is requisite in the infancy of their spiritual life?

7. Pastoral visiting is essential to secure a pastoral connection

with the youth and children of our charge. We are under the obligation imposed by the solemnity of a religious oath, (the most sacred of all oaths,) contained in our ordination vows, "to instruct the youth." As to the advantages of a general connection between the ministry and the youth of their charge, a volume would scarcely be sufficient to trace them. The fairest field for ministerial labor is among the young. There, if anywhere, may we look for the absence of fixed sinful habits and strong sinful passions. There, if anywhere, are to be found minds open to conviction, and among the converts from the ranks of the young we are to look for the materials for useful servants of the church. If the aged are converted, the days of their activity have gone by, and the time of their service is short. The young are the hope of the church, and the hope of the world. Their peculiar dangers also call for the faithful services of the ministry. It is their misfortune that their passions come to maturity much sooner than their understandings. Unlearned in the school of experience, buoyant and active, they are indeed in "slippery paths," and need a most zealous and affectionate inculcation of the lessons of the Bible. They are also exposed when, like wax to the seal, they are peculiarly susceptible of impression to the efforts of the abettors of error. Infidelity has of late assumed a new shape, and come forth paying court to the multitude and professing particular respect for the young. Semi-infidelity, if possible more dangerous than the former, under the name of Universalism, *et cætera*, is also particular in its professions of regard for the young. Under these circumstances the duties of the ministry to the youthful portion of the community have become extremely important and arduous; and it becomes every minister, as he regards the interests of religion and the welfare of the present and future generations, to seek to establish and keep up a close connection with the youth of his flock. He should watch over the Sunday school, meet with the superintendents and teachers, address the school, labor with the parents, establish and superintend Bible classes, and visit the children and youth, with affectionate solicitude. Unless this be done, and done in good earnest, we may expect to see our young people carried away in a flood from us, if not to see them whelmed in the gulf of infidelity and licentiousness.

8. Pastoral fidelity is essential to the piety of the ministry. No one who reads his Bible can doubt but that God enjoins the duties of the pastor as well and as strongly as those of the preacher. The minister also binds himself when he is received into the church to perform the former as well as the latter. If, therefore, he is appointed to the charge of a congregation, and only preaches, he violates a promissory obligation, and a Scriptural obligation. And is this any thing short of moral delinquency? Can it be otherwise than that his piety should decline apace? Can he be alive to God while he is daily bringing upon himself such fearful condemnation? Difficulties may be in the way, but they must be met. The disadvantages of being obliged to go among strangers every two years, diffidence and want of address, may interpose; but we entered the ministry with our eyes open: we also professed to be "moved of the Holy Ghost to take this office and ministry;" and there is now but one way to save our piety, perhaps our souls—we must meet our obligations and discharge them. But this is by no means the

only light in which the question is to be viewed. If it is a duty to go from house to house in the service of our divine Master, it is also a high and holy privilege. The pastoral work has advantages and consolations peculiar to itself. How sweet is that "communion of saints," that Christian fellowship, which is enjoyed by the servant of God while engaged on these errands of love! His intercourse is with the heirs of immortality. He enters the habitations where God is honored, and his worship made welcome—where the Son of peace has taken up his abode. He waters, and is watered; and as he goes he feels as the disciples felt whose hearts "burned within them" as they communed with the Saviour and each other. He retires home from these seasons of mercy with a heart softened and subdued, and sweet is his pillow while the blessings of those to whom he has ministered rest upon him. Conscience approves, and Heaven smiles, and his piety daily matures.

9. Faithful pastoral labor will be found one of the most efficient means of removing the financial embarrassments under which we, as a church, so generally labor. These embarrassments are no doubt owing, to a considerable extent, to two facts. First. As a church, we are still in our infancy. It is within the memory of some still living that not a Methodist church had been planted in this country. Other churches were already established, and had their houses of worship and institutions of learning when we were not yet a people. To build up a denomination is not the work of a moment, and we are just beginning to get systematized and established. Secondly. A large portion of our work is in parts still new. Methodism has been a pioneer upon the frontier, and admirable was the providence which raised up an itinerant ministry, zealous, bold, and self-sacrificing, for such a work as following up the tide of emigration. But it has been, and must still be done, at a great personal sacrifice on the part of the ministry. In the older parts of the work, however, we have not this latter difficulty. Yet the best of our annual conferences in their reports exhibit a great deficiency in finances. Now this state of things is fraught with mischief. It drives many of our best men to locations, or to seek wherewithal to feed and clothe their families in other churches. There is no need that these embarrassments should continue much longer. Our church is getting to be able, in most of the circuits and stations in the older conferences at least, to support the ministry comfortably and respectably; and if a general and faithful effort is made and persevered in, the work will be accomplished. Yet we may despair of its being done, unless our ministers are faithful in fulfilling their pastoral obligations. The obligation to render unto the ministry a support is consequent upon the ministry's rendering faithful services in "spiritual things." Selfish and cruel indeed must that congregation be who, having the ability to render a competent support, will still allow a *diligent and faithful minister* to live and labor among them in penury and embarrassment. I am persuaded such congregations are few.

If, however, a minister be appointed to a charge of not over three or four hundred, or even no more than two hundred or one hundred and fifty members, the whole of whom, with the regular members of the congregation, being so few, he might visit most or all of them in three months; and if after he has been in such a charge one or

two years numbers can say he has never so much as paid them a single visit; if, indeed, he has passed week after week, and scarcely visited a single family, while Bible classes, Sunday schools, the sick, and the delinquent are neglected,—need we be surprised that under a system whose ministers are supported by the voluntary contributions of the people, if such unfaithful men go away deficient? For one I am persuaded that there is no inconsiderable deficiency in the performance of pastoral duties in the conference of which I have the privilege of being a member; and while I rejoice to see measures going forward for relieving our ministry of those pressing embarrassments under which it has suffered, I am yet persuaded that the subject under consideration must be faithfully attended to if we would succeed.

10. The faithful discharge of pastoral duties is a debt of honor which we owe to our brethren in the ministry. In all associated bodies there are certain obligations by which the members of the association are bound, and which are the terms of the compact, and each individual is bound by every honorable principle faithfully to meet and discharge those obligations. In the Methodist Episcopal Church we solemnly covenant together to go out and labor in the Lord's vineyard "by preaching the word publicly *and from house to house.*" We agree to take that part of the work which is assigned us, and to change our fields of labor once in two years, as the predecessors and successors of each other. Now if we be unfaithful in this work, we not only injure our brethren in our respective charges, but we violate the principles of honor toward our brethren in the ministry. Suppose our predecessor has been faithful in the discharge of his ministerial duties, and left his charge flourishing as the garden of the Lord. With weeping and fasting in labors, and watching with weary limbs, and often an aching heart, he has toiled to clear the heritage of the Lord. He has visited the sick, instructed the ignorant, comforted the afflicted, aroused the careless, and alarmed the vicious, by every means in his power. He has watched over the young, visited the Sabbath school, instructed the Bible class, and his labors have been blessed in the conversion of many souls. The time of his departure arrives, and with painful feelings on his part, and tears on that of his charge, he leaves them. Suppose his successor arrives, but soon discovers himself to be a man of another spirit. No vigilant watch-care is extended to the classes; the converts are neglected; the Sabbath school and the Bible class are overlooked. The connection between the pastor and the young, which had been formed with care, and maintained by untiring effort, is broken. The former pastor receives letters from his former friends filled with sorrowful tidings of backslidings and declensions. He visits the scene of his former labors, and finds the once fair and flourishing garden of the Lord, which he left blooming in beauty and redolent in fragrance, overrun with noxious weeds; while the plants he had cultivated with so much care are sickly or dying. Has he no cause to complain? Can he see the hedge broken down, and the wild boar out of the woods, and the beast out of the forest, devouring God's vineyard through the neglect of an unfaithful husbandman without feeling that every honorable principle has been sacrificed? Again: suppose a faithful pastor succeeds an unfaithful one, and finds every thing bearing the aspect of neglect. Perhaps from

the scene of his former arduous labors he comes to his new charge with impaired health, feeble lungs, and shattered nerves. He might perhaps be able to meet the labors which properly belong to him, but he finds the work of the *two preceding years* left for him to do. Both financial and spiritual matters are in confusion. His predecessor, by his culpable neglect, has virtually taken the bread out of his mouth, the clothes off from his back, and put a burden upon him which he has neither health nor strength to meet. Before him also is the poor consolation of reflecting that if he should succeed in improving matters, he has no security against their being again prostrated as soon as he shall leave. Is this an imaginary picture? Let those answer who have wept over the waste places of Zion.

11. Another argument in favor of fidelity in the pastoral work may be brought, or rather it comes to us from the state of our country. Its character is in the process of formation. Towns and villages are rising up, as by enchantment, all around us. Now the features which these towns and villages assume at the commencement they will probably retain, to a great extent, for generations to come. What has given to New-England her churches, her schools and colleges, her intelligence and enterprise, and made her emphatically

"The land of the free and the home of the brave?"

She was founded by the pilgrims. These noble men, with their indomitable love of liberty, their unwavering attachment to science and religion, impressed on New-England their "own image and superscription," and long may she wear it. Avoiding a few of the errors into which those pilgrim-fathers fell, let other towns and villages be formed on the same model. Let religion enter as largely into the plan, and let the ministry of our church, in connection with the general ministry of the nation, use every exertion in their power to give a decidedly religious character to every rising neighborhood in our land. Those ministers who are placed by the God of providence in the midst of the cities, towns, and villages of a rising nation act under a weight of responsibility which it is difficult adequately to estimate. Who can tell what may be the result of a single revival or of the conversion of a single individual, and who can tell what may be the result of a single pastoral visit? A prominent individual may be awakened: a single pastoral visit may turn the scale when he hangs trembling between life and death; and the conversion of that prominent and leading man may give a religious character to the whole place. On the other hand, neglect at such a time may be followed by the most sad consequences. That prominent individual may lose his serious impressions, become hostile to the interests of religion. Talent may raise him to eminence, and from his bad eminence may come down a powerful and successful opposition to all that is sacred. This is no fancy picture. A small effort at the *decisive hour* has often been followed by the most momentous consequences. A faithful pastor has planted in a single year the seed that has brought forth successive harvests in future generations. Religion, once fairly established in a family or village, may continue in that family or village to the end of time.

12. The last observation I shall make on this part of the subject is, that if a minister ever intends to begin the pastoral work, he must

begin young—at the very commencement of his ministerial career. I need not here remark on the power of habit, in general. Ministers, above all men, are observant here. They are the very men who are from Sabbath to Sabbath warning their hearers against becoming *accustomed* to evil, and of the necessity of *habituating* themselves to the service of God. But here I would particularly remark, that if the pastoral department of a minister's work be neglected while he is young, it is almost certain that it will be ever afterward. Neither the voice of conscience, nor ordination vows, nor the suffering cause of religion, nor the remonstrances of the people will cure a negligent minister of his inveterate habit. The only way, generally, is for him to give up the ministry; and if he will not discharge its duties, the sooner he does so the better. True, God may have called him to the work, and there may be a "wo" resting upon him if he leave it; but it is better he should suffer the consequences of his own unfaithfulness than that he should occupy a place some more faithful man might otherwise fill. Besides, his *wo* may be less if he leave entirely than though he shut others out of the place which he refuses properly to occupy. But let a young minister come forward and enter upon this work in a spirit worthy of his high calling. He will meet with many difficulties, no doubt. He will find occasion for all the grace, firmness, self-denial, and tact of which he is master; but his profiting will appear to himself and to others. His successes will encourage him; he will be comforted of God; and the blessings and prayers of the pious will accompany him. This work will grow pleasant, and he will become skilful in it. A rich field of observation will open before him, from which he will gather choice materials for his ministry, and while he is thus "watching" others, the rich dews of divine grace and soft showers of mercy will be falling upon him, and his soul will be indeed "like a well watered garden, whose fruit shall not fail, and whose leaf shall not wither." He will be in God's hands the blessed instrument "of turning many to righteousness," who shall be as "stars in the crown of his rejoicing in the day of the Lord Jesus."

II. A second point of importance is the acquisition of suitable qualifications for the pastoral work. Great attention is deservedly paid to the acquisition of suitable qualifications for the pulpit. But how is it that so little is thought or said of pastoral qualifications? If any one suppose it an easy matter to be a good pastor, he need only make a fair trial to find himself greatly mistaken. There will be found in all denominations several excellent preachers to one thoroughly qualified and faithful pastor. This is doubtless owing, in part, to the fact that far less pains are taken to prepare for pastoral labor than for the pulpit; but it is also owing to the fact that pastoral duties require very important qualifications, and are duties of a very arduous character.

1. To be a successful pastor requires much intelligence. In this work all sorts of persons are encountered; human nature, in all its multiplied forms and varied phases, presents itself to our view. At one place you are by the bed of sickness, where an immortal being stands on the verge of the eternal world, and where to inspire a false hope might end in eternal ruin, or where to throw back an inquiring penitent into despondency might be equally fatal; or you may find a careless soul, whose sins are unforgiven, but the physi-

cian and surrounding friends fear if you alarm, lest the disorder should be aggravated; and you fear, unless you do, that a soul will be lost. In the next house you have a different case of conscience to solve, which requires much critical knowledge of Christian casuistry. In the third you meet with the young, and need to possess the rare gift of making yourself agreeable to them, that you may open to yourself a door of usefulness here. You pass on to a fourth, and find a family of your charge who are ruining the immortal souls intrusted to their care by misplaced fondness and cruel indulgence. Here you have a task requiring all your skill and knowledge. To let the matter pass is unfaithfulness to God and unkindness to a misguided family. To speak, and escape the displeasure of your auditors, is no easy task. Next you meet with a decided worldling, and again with a skeptic, or perhaps an opposer. Is any other than a person of intelligence qualified for such a work?

2. To be a good pastor requires good conversational powers. A pastor should be able to converse with precision and ease, and if possible with elegance. In the company of people of education and refinement he should be able to appear and feel at home. For a minister in such company to be thrown into embarrassment is a disgrace to his office and an injury to the cause in which he is engaged. Association is a principle of most extensive influence, and men very generally associate a cause with its advocates, and judge of the one from the other. Again: a minister must come in contact with the young and the ignorant, and he needs the ability of conversing in an easy, intelligible, and interesting manner with them. To acquire, therefore, an easy and agreeable diction is worth the most untiring efforts.

3. A pastor should be affable and easy in his manners. "Be courteous" is a command of Scripture, and so essential a qualification is this for a pastor, that many learned, pious, and highly gifted ministers have been nearly useless, as pastors, for want of it. "An affable man is one who may be approached and accosted without difficulty or embarrassment—one who has the happy talent of conversing pleasantly and courteously, and of placing every one in conversation perfectly at his ease. The opposites of this quality are coldness, haughtiness, habits of taciturnity, arising from whatever cause, and, in short, every thing in manner that is adapted to repel or to prevent freedom and comfort of approach. The minister is not only called to visit from house to house, to address all classes of persons on the most important of all subjects, and to study to gain access to the minds of the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, but all descriptions of persons are in the habit of resorting to him in private, as well as in public, for counsel and aid. The perplexed, the doubting, the timid, the feeble, the desponding, are all, it may be, in succession seeking in him a counselor and guide. How unhappy when his personal manners are such as to repel and discourage—nay, more, in some cases how fatal to the eternal interests of men when, instead of a manner which invites confidence and inspires freedom of communication, the ambassador of Christ, by his repulsive mode of address, as it were 'breaks the bruised reed,' 'quenches the smoking flax,' or so completely chills and discourages the anxious inquirer as to deter him from ever making a second visit."*

* Miller's Letters on Clerical Manners and Habits.

4. A pastor should possess dignity of manners. I cannot better introduce this topic than by again quoting from the excellent book from which the last passage was cited. "By dignity," says Dr. Miller, "I mean that happy mixture of *gravity* and *elevation* in human deportment which evinces a mind habitually thoughtful, serious, and set on high things—an air and manner opposed to *levity*, opposed to that propensity to *jesting* which is so often manifested by some who bear the sacred office, opposed to what is *grovelling*, opposed, in short, to every species of *lightness* or *volatility*."—"The dignity of manner which I wish to inculcate may be impaired by various little infelicities of deportment into which those who are not delicately on their guard may be betrayed. I have known worthy men who had so little knowledge of human nature, and so little sense of propriety, that they suffered themselves to be involved in angry contentions with others, with stage-drivers, and with boatmen and other similar men, with whom they were brought in contact. It is unbecoming enough for *any* grave person to be involved in such controversies; but for a clergyman it is peculiarly unbecoming."—"Another characteristic and advantage of dignity of manners is, that when properly exercised it tends to repress the risings and repel the approaches of impertinence."—"There is something defective, says Mr. Jay, especially in a minister, unless his character produce an atmosphere around him which is felt as soon as entered. It is not enough for him to have courage to *reprove* certain things, he should have dignity enough to *prevent* them; and he *will* if the *Christian* be commensurate with the *preacher*, and if he walk worthy of God, who hath called us into his kingdom and glory."

III. The manner in which a pastor should conduct himself among his people, particularly while going "from house to house," is a matter of no little importance.

1. His visits should be short. If due caution be not exercised here, these visits will make such heavy drafts upon his time that he will have little or none left for the cultivation of his mind and preparation for the pulpit. But if his visits be not allowed generally to exceed twenty minutes, or a half hour, he may perform twenty or more in each week, and still have as much time for study as his preparations require, or his health will allow.

2. In his pastoral visits he should make it a point to be decidedly religious; not that he should be abrupt in his method of introducing the solemn subject of religion, or force those into a religious conversation who manifest a determination to avoid it; but he should gain access for his subject, if possible, and never leave a house or company without leaving some testimony, direct or indirect, in favor of the cause of Christ. Unless there be circumstances which render it impracticable, or decidedly inexpedient, all pastoral visits should be closed with prayer. In these visits the youth, the children, and the domestics should receive particular attention. The latter particularly are too apt to be overlooked, even in Christian families. It will be found decidedly preferable to converse with the different members of the family alone whenever practicable. There is generally a strong reluctance to speaking freely in the presence of other members of the same family in most minds.

3. He should beware of the spirit of proselytism, and be much

more anxious to see people Christians than to see them attached to his particular branch of the church. There are some ministers who have very little success in the awakening or conversion of souls themselves, who nevertheless have tact enough (connected with no small portion of meanness) to enter into other men's labors and proselyte with success. No honorable person can respect such a minister. The moment a proselyting spirit is discovered in a minister his influence and respectability are seriously injured. It is, however, by no means a work of proselytism to gather those who have been awakened and converted under his own ministry into his church. Nor is it a work of proselytism to prevent, if possible, their being proselyted by others, or even to persuade men publicly to avow and support the sentiments they honestly believe.

4. A pastor should be faithful and persevering in his pastoral efforts. To visit so many families, and pray in so many houses, should never satisfy his conscience. It is possible in preaching to have no higher object than to preach a true and correct sermon; but a faithful minister will look beyond barely preaching a sermon. He is seeking for souls, and is not satisfied unless he secure them. So in visiting, the faithful pastor is after souls, and the visit is lightly regarded by him unless something toward their salvation is accomplished. I cannot better close these remarks than by referring, in the language of Mr. Wesley and Mr. Gilpin, to that most excellent of pastors, Mr. Fletcher. "Like a vigilant pastor," says Mr. Gilpin, "he daily acquainted himself with the wants and dispositions of his people, anxiously watching over their several households and diligently teaching them from family to family. Esteeming no man too mean, too ignorant, or too profane to merit his affectionate attention, he condescended to the lowest and most unworthy of his flock, cheerfully becoming the servant of all that he *might gain the more*. In the performance of this part of his duty he discovered an admirable mixture of discretion and zeal, solemnity and sweetness. He rebuked not an elder, but entreated him as a father. To younger men he addressed himself with the affection of a brother, and to children with the tenderness of a parent, witnessing, both to small and great, the redemption that is in Jesus, and persuading them to cast in their lot with the people of God. In some of these holy visits the earnest and constraining manner in which he has pleaded the cause of piety has melted down a whole family at once. The old and the young have mingled their tears together, and solemnly determined to turn right humbly to their God. There were, indeed, several families in his populous parish to which he had no access, whose members, loving darkness rather than light, agreed to deny him admission, lest their deeds should be reproved. In such cases, where his zeal for the salvation of individuals could not possibly be manifested by persuasion and entreaty, it was effectually discovered by supplication and prayer. Nor did he ever pass the door of an opposing family without breathing out an earnest desire that the door of mercy might never be barred against their approaches."

"With respect to his attendance upon the sick, he was exemplary and indefatigable. It was a work," says Mr. Wesley, "for which he was always ready. If he heard the knocker in the coldest winter night, his window was thrown open in a moment. And when

he understood that some one was hurt in a pit, or that a neighbor was likely to die, no consideration was ever had of the darkness of the night or the severity of the weather; but this answer was always given, I will attend you immediately."

For the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review.

ART. III.—PAYSON'S LIFE AND WRITINGS.

- I. *A Memoir of the Rev. Edward Payson, D.D., late Pastor of the Second Church in Portland.* By Asa Cummings, Editor of the Christian Mirror. Fifth edition. Boston and New-York. 1832.
- II. *Sermons by the late Edward Payson, D.D.* 8vo. Portland. 1828.
- III. *Sermons by Edward Payson, D.D.* 12mo. Portland. 1831. (Another selection.)
- IV. *Sermons for Christian Families, by Edward Payson, D.D.* 18mo. Boston. 1832.

EDWARD PAYSON was an eloquent and eminently successful preacher. He was more—and this reveals the secret of his success, if not the mainspring which gave power to his eloquence; he was a zealous Christian, a man of prayer. His career, indeed, was brief: he was translated in his forty-fifth year; but it was glorious, and his memory is blessed. The cool, calculating disciple will probably consider his abundant labors and his untiring zeal as suicidal, and look upon his early though triumphant death as little better than self-immolation. There are those whose zeal for the glory of the Lord of hosts is amazingly dampened by their desire for, and, in their opinion, by the necessity of, self-preservation. It is, confessedly, the first law of nature; but it is a law not found in the ethics of Christ, nor deemed paramount by his apostles—a law which, though it may not be utterly trampled upon by their successors, yet has not the binding force of a cobweb when obedience to it would hazard the salvation of those for whom Christ died, or jeopard the advancement of God's glory. To spend and be spent, is the motto of Paul's legitimate successors. Like him, Payson counted not his life dear unto him so he might finish his course with joy, and the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus. Enough for him to know,

“The less of this cold earth, the more of heaven :
The shorter life, the longer immortality.”

But it may be asked—and similar questions often arise—would not a greater share of prudence have insured a larger amount of usefulness? To this, a categorical answer, of course, cannot be given. We know not, and have no means of ascertaining, what *might have been*. Although it will be apparent to every reader of his memoir that prudence would, in all probability, have prolonged his life, yet in man's brief history, and, least of all, in the history of an ambassador of Christ, length of life and usefulness are not synonymous. Had he labored less, and preached seldomer; had his errands of love in search of his Master's lost sheep, his visits of mercy to the sick and the dying, been more infrequent: in a word, what his hand found to do, had he *not* done with his might, Edward Payson might still have been an inhabitant of this lower world. He might have

been, but we do not *know* that he would have been. It is written, "He that loveth his life shall lose it."

He was born in 1783. The precise date of his conversion is not ascertained. Favored with the instructions, example, and prayers of devotedly pious parents, he was early initiated in the duties of religion. At the age of three years, it is said, he would converse with his mother on religious topics; and although there is no positive evidence that he was a subject of regenerating grace at that early period, yet there can be no doubt that it was owing partly to the theoretical knowledge of the plan of salvation thus early acquired, and partly to the strict morality in which he had been nurtured, that his entrance into the spiritual kingdom was "without observation." The transition in some is indisputably far more obvious than in others; and the relative magnitude of this change depends greatly upon previous habits and instruction.

After graduating at the Harvard University in 1803, he took charge of an academy at Portland—an employment which, from the unceasing routine of the same duties, however favorable it may be to growth in grace, is not calculated for the development of talents which attract the public eye. It was while he held this situation that he made a profession of religion by uniting with the church of which his father was pastor. The church was Calvinistic, and his biographer, himself a Calvinist, has given us a sample of the embarrassments in which Mr. Payson thus early found himself involved with reference to the peculiarities of that creed:

"Scarcely two months," he tells us, "had elapsed from the time he made a public profession of religion before Mr. Payson felt his mind embarrassed in relation to the doctrines of the Bible as understood by the Calvinists."—*Memoir*, p. 40.

The reader may possibly be inclined to wonder that so acute a mind as Payson's did not at least *perceive* the difficulties of Calvinism *before* he united with that branch of the church. In our own denomination the doctrines of the Bible, as understood by us, have never, in a single instance, so far as our experience extends, caused any embarrassment after an individual has united with us. And the reason, on a moment's reflection, is obvious. Arminianism is fair and aboveboard; it has no hair-splitting distinctions without a difference. There is no *indoctrinating process* through which the young disciple is called to pass. The doctrines he is taught are the same after as they were before his conversion. Very different is the Calvinistic process. By our brethren of that order the gospel is preached to sinners with a fulness and a freeness as if they did really believe, without mental reservation, that all their hearers have a natural and a moral ability to comply with the gracious invitations of Christ. But after the sinner has embraced the Saviour, and united with the church, *then* the secrets of the creed are spread before him; and his mind, as in the case before us, begins to be "embarrassed in relation to the doctrines of the Bible as understood by Calvinists."

The first intimation of Payson's perplexity on this subject, his biographer tells us, is in the following words, (apparently an extract from a letter to some friend:)—"I have lately read Cole's Discourses. It is a very comfortable doctrine for the elect, but not so for the sinner. My feelings say it is true, but reason wants to put

in an oar." Again he says: "*I know not what to do.* On one hand the arguments in favor of Calvinism are strong; and what is more to the point, *I feel* that most of them must be true; and yet there are difficulties, strong difficulties * * * * * in the way." *Ibid.*, p. 40.

The hiatus, indicating an omission in this last paragraph, is, to say the least, discreditable to the biographer. It looks suspicious. Did the original read, *insuperable* difficulties in the way?

As Payson observes, Calvinism is a very comfortable doctrine for the *elect*. Hence its peculiarities are carefully concealed from the individual, at least as a general thing, until he has obtained a hope that he himself is one of that number. *Then* the comforts of the creed and his reason are placed in opposing balances. They remain in equipoise a longer or a shorter space according to the temperament of the individual. "*I know not what to do.*" Selfishness is then thrown into the scale with comfort, and Calvinism triumphs. Did the reader ever know a man professing to believe the peculiarities of Calvinism who did not also believe that he had a hope that he was one of the elect?

In alluding to these things it is far from our purpose to question Mr. Payson's sincerity, or to intimate any doubts respecting the strength of his reasoning faculties. We can only regret that with his powerful intellect he did not grapple with the "strong difficulties" of the Calvinian creed *before* he united with that branch of the church; and that, even *after* that event, he did not, to use his own expression, allow his "reason to put in an oar." Even then, in his hands, it might have sculled him—to pursue the metaphor—clean through his difficulties into the broad sea of God's impartial love. That infinite Being to whom man is indebted for his reasoning faculties never gave him a revelation, or invented a system, that *contradicts* his reason. The same fountain doth not send forth sweet water and bitter.

Payson's Calvinism, however, seems to have been of the more moderate sort; and, if we may judge from the volumes of his sermons before us, the peculiarities of that creed made but a very small part of his pulpit exhibitions.

His mind appears to have been exercised with reference to his call to the ministry while engaged in the duties of his school—in which, as we gather from his journal, he had the happy faculty of blending religious with literary instruction. He was in the habit of lecturing his pupils on subjects connected with Christianity, and some of these lectures were protracted in length to three quarters of an hour—an admirable preparative for the more public duties of the sanctuary, to which he soon after devoted himself. The ordination sermon at his installation as associate pastor of the Congregational church at Portland was preached by his father; and though, as a literary production, it is not remarkable, yet from the rather unusual circumstance of a venerable parent's thus officiating at the most important era of his son's glorious career, it possesses considerable interest. We copy a few of the concluding sentences:

"In laboring to form your mind to ministerial fidelity, may I not hope for some assistance from that active principle of filial affection which has ever rendered you studious of a father's comfort? I can think with calmness, nay, with a degree of pleasure, of your

suffering for righteousness' sake ; and, should the world pour upon you its obloquy, its scorn and reproach, for your fidelity to your Master's cause, a father's heart would still embrace you with, if possible, increased fondness. But to see you losing sight of the great objects which ought to engage your attention, courting the applause of the world, infected with the infidel sentiments of the day, and neglecting the immortal interests of those now about to be committed to your care,—this, O my son, I could not support. It would bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave. But is it possible that in such a cause, with such motives to fidelity, and with prospects, may I not add, so peculiarly pleasing as those which now surround you, you should, notwithstanding, prove unfaithful ? It is possible ; for there is nothing too base, too ungrateful, or destructive of our own most important interests, for human nature to commit : and unless the grace of the Lord Jesus preserve you, the glory of God will be forgotten, your Saviour will, by you, be crucified afresh, and his cause exposed to shame ; your sacred character will become your reproach, and, instead of the blessings of many ready to perish, you will accumulate the curses of perishing souls upon your head. May your preservation from this awful fate be the theme of our future eternal praises. * * * But I must set bounds to the effusion of feelings which have, perhaps, already exhausted the patience of this assembly. Receive, my dear son, in one word, the sum of all a father's fond wishes : 'Be thou faithful unto death.' "

These fond anticipations of a father's heart were fully realized. Popularity, not always indeed the test of faithfulness, attended the young pastor from the commencement of his efforts : a popularity not coveted by himself, but the unavoidable result of talents well employed, and zeal and fidelity increasing and ever visible. Over the same church in which, as we have seen, he was ordained, he continued to exercise the pastoral oversight even unto death. In the course of his life he received several "calls," as the technical phrase is, to leave the church in Portland, and accept other charges. Some of these "calls," particularly one from the Cedar-st. church, in New-York, were long and loud. But he heeded them not, showing himself "not greedy of filthy lucre," and desirous to abstain from even the "appearance of evil." Alluding to these repeated calls, in a letter to his mother dated Jan. 25, 1826, he says :

"A removal would be death to my reputation in this part of the country—I mean my Christian reputation ; and, what is far worse, it would bring great reproach upon religion. At present my worst enemies, and the worst enemies of religion, seem disposed to allow that I am sincere, upright, and uninfluenced by those motives which govern worldly minded men. But had I gone to Boston, and, much more, should I now go to New-York, they would at once triumphantly exclaim, 'Ah ! they are all alike ; all governed by worldly motives. They preach against the love of money, and the love of applause, but they will gratify either of these passions when a fair opportunity offers.' Now I had much rather die than give them an occasion thus to speak reproachfully. It would be overthrowing all which I have been laboring to build up. Indeed, I can see no reason why God should suffer these repeated invitations to be sent to me, unless it be to give me an opportunity to show the world that

all ministers are not actuated by mercenary or ambitious views. I have already some reason to believe that my refusal to accept the two calls has done more to convince the enemies of religion that there is a reality in it than a thousand sermons would have done." *Memoir*, p. 263.

The preceding extract shows, in an amiable light, his jealousy for the interests of his Master's cause. It exhibits, also, in vivid colors, the inherent evils of the "call" system. Under what other system would the world need evidence that "all ministers are not actuated by mercenary or selfish views?" It is true, and we take pleasure in bearing testimony to the fact, that the responses to these "calls" are not, in every instance, evidence of mercenary or ambitious views; but it is equally true, as Mr. Payson hints, the world thinks they are, especially when the "call" is from a less to a more honorable and lucrative station; and the converse is seldom given, and still seldomer complied with. But the ill effects of the system are not seen only in this way. The opinions of the gainsayer and the scoffer might be deemed of little import. The effects of the system are positively and palpably injurious to the church. At any moment the ties which bind a faithful minister to the flock who are perfectly satisfied with their pastor are liable to be severed. And this because some other flock, who are better provided with this world's goods, think proper to give him a "call." Thus pulpit eloquence, like that of the bar, is made a marketable commodity; zeal the standard of salary; and the gifts of the Holy Ghost are exercised at the "call" of the highest bidder. "To the poor," said Christ, "the gospel is preached;" but, on this system, it is most evident that unless the supply of laborers is fully equal to the demand, the poorer portions of God's heritage must go untilled.

The troubles and commotions arising in the flock of Christ even from the prospect of the operations of this system are, we were going to say, ludicrous, and they are so, but at the same time they are lamentable. Take the following specimen:

"When Park-street church, in Boston, was left vacant by the removal of Dr. Griffin, Mr. Payson's charge had unpleasant apprehensions of losing their beloved pastor. It is in allusion to this time that he says in a letter: 'We have been kept in a fever here all this winter by perpetual alarms from Boston. Because I do not refuse before I am asked, and exclaim loudly against going, some of my people suspect I wish to go. * * * No application has yet been made from B., though much has been said about it. It is very doubtful whether any will be made. I feel very easy about it myself, but the church are in great tribulation.'—*Memoir*, p. 261, seq.

It is not quite clear that the tribulation which the Saviour forewarned his followers awaited them was to arise from any such source, though we are willing to admit, on the strength of Mr. Payson's assertion, seeing he had the best right to know, that the tribulation of the second church in Portland was on this occasion great.

History has given us no hint of any afflictions of this nature in the early ages of the Christian church. It is nowhere intimated that the Ephesians were in any "fever" lest some wealthier church should succeed in robbing them of the services of Timothy by holding out to him a prospect of greater usefulness in the shape of a larger salary.

While on this subject it occurs to us to remark here, for the special benefit of those who are continually harping on the authority of bishops, and the vested rights and powers of conferences, that in perusing the memoir before us we have been forcibly struck with the unequal and one-sided nature of the contract called a settlement or installation. Had Mr. Payson been the very reverse of what he was; instead of being popular had he been disagreeable to a large majority of his people; nay, after his instalment had he proved utterly deficient, and the church unanimously desired his removal, there was no power by which it could be effected against his will. The contract bound them, and left him free. Nothing short of death, or detection in gross immorality sufficient to deprive him altogether of church membership, can cut the knot with which installation ties the people to the pastor. To him it is a thread of gossamer; to them a cord of perdurable toughness.

"I have much new cause for gratitude," says Payson in a letter to a friend, "since I left home. The minister at —, a smooth, liberal preacher, has been long intemperate, and lately fell from his horse into a slough, on his way to meeting. He was, on this, dismissed; and as he was not the first bad minister this people had been cursed with, they have contracted a strong prejudice against the Congregational clergy."—*Memoir*, p. 162.

We have made this extract for the sole purpose of illustrating the point before us. This man, it seems, had been long intemperate; but had he not fallen from his horse in consequence, and thus given evidence of his besetment, sufficient to fix the charge conclusively upon him, he might, for all that appears to the contrary, have still been the people's pastor, and had a *legal* demand upon them for his support. We leave this subject—it is not a pleasant one—for the consideration of our brethren of the Evangelist and the kindred genus of mote-spiers.

Borne on the full tide of popularity, from the first hour of his pastoral labors at Portland, Mr. Payson's experience coincided with that of others who have been similarly circumstanced. Popularity, although it afforded him the means of extending his usefulness, cost him dear. "No one," says he, "can conceive how dearly it is purchased; what unspeakably dreadful temptations, buffetings, and workings of depravity are necessary to counteract the pernicious effects of this poison."

It is an exceedingly subtle question, how far a desire for popularity may lawfully extend on the part of an ambassador for Christ. On the one hand, a reputation for learning and eloquence may, in many cases will, extend a minister's prospective usefulness, and in this respect it is doubtless desirable; yet, on the other, there is unspeakably great danger that popularity may be sought for its own sake, and, when obtained, efforts be made to extend and perpetuate it not warranted by the simplicity of the gospel. What may be lawful as a means becomes sinful as an end. It were well if those who are ambitious of a popularity like that of Payson would ask themselves a question similar to one proposed to his disciples by the Lord Jesus on a certain occasion: "Are we able to drink of the cup that he drank of, and to be baptized with the baptism that he was baptized with?" and not rashly to answer, "We are able." The blast that shivers in fragments the lofty cedar passes harmlessly

over the more humble and therefore more useful shrubbery. A few extracts from his journal, written for his own eye alone, and in a character which cost his biographer much pains to decipher, will abundantly evidence that popularity is not a flowery path, nor eminent reputation a bed of roses.

“Feb. 2, 1807.—Was amazingly given up to wandering imaginations. If I attempted to pray, in a moment my thoughts were in the ends of the earth. If I attempted to read the Bible, every verse almost afforded ground of doubt and caviling. This fully convinced me that Satan is able to make me doubt even the existence of God.”

“March 7.—Were it not for the promised help of my Saviour, I would think no more of preaching; but labor for daily bread.”

“June 18.—Suffered more of hell to-day than ever I did in my life. O such torment! I wanted but little of being distracted. I could neither read, nor write, nor pray, nor sit still.”

“Jan. 1, 1824.—Rose early and tried to pray; but a weak, languid frame crushed me down. I have, however, reason to bless God that he allows such a wretch as I am to serve him at all. Groaned and struggled with my weakness before God. Read a number of passages in my diary, especially what is recorded under date of December 16th, 1815. Am glad I kept a journal. I had otherwise forgotten much of what I have done against God, and of what he has done for me. Was confounded at what I read. My words are swallowed up. My life, my ministry, has been madness, madness! What shall I do? where shall I hide? To sin after I had sinned so much, and after I had been forgiven! But I cannot write! I cannot think! and if my sins appear so black in my book, how do they appear in God's!”

A few extracts from his epistolary correspondence will farther elucidate this point:

“My other chief besetting sin, which will cut out abundance of work for me, is fondness for applause. When I sit down to write, this demon is immediately in the way, prompting to seek for such observations as will be admired, rather than such as will be felt, and have a tendency to do good.”

Again, writing to his mother he says:

“I am harassed with such violent temptations from morning to night, and from night till morning, with scarce a moment's intermission, that I am utterly weary of life, and ready to despair. It seems as if I must one day perish by the hands of this accursed Saul which seeks to destroy me. O my dearest mother, do pity me, and pray for me; for I am sifted like wheat.”

And again, under a subsequent date:

“After telling you that religion thus flourishes among us, I am ashamed to complain; for what reason of complaint can a minister have while he sees the cause of Christ triumphant? Nor do I complain of any thing except myself. Every earthly thing is imbibed to me, and the enjoyments of religion are kept far above out of my reach. I am overwhelmed by one wave of temptation after another.”

The following extract shows the severity of these temptations, not uncommon to eminent ministers. The late Robert Hall, in his day perhaps the most popular preacher in England, suffered from the same source: and Haliburton, whose memoirs have been lately

republished by our Book Agents, had a similar experience, expressing himself in nearly the same terms :

"Dec. 5, 1823.—I have been sick, and laid by from preaching on thanksgiving day and two Sabbaths, but am now able to resume my labors. But O the temptations which have harassed me for the last three months! I have met with nothing like them in books. I dare not mention them to any mortal, lest they should trouble him as they have troubled me."

We have nothing to say on the apparent discrepancy between the theoretical and practical doctrines of Calvinism as developed in the preceding extracts. Payson, though he held, as we suppose, to the theory of the perseverance of the saints, yet here gives practical evidence of the great and increasing difficulties himself had to contend with in order to make his calling and election sure. His sentiment in other words is, If I do not persevere and overcome these yearly increasing difficulties I shall fall. This, though from a Calvinist, is Arminianism.

Payson, however, did persevere, and obtained a complete and glorious victory over these temptations ; and to this circumstance he was indebted for the readiness and skill with which in the course of his ministry he was enabled to administer consolation to those of his flock who labored under circumstances of peculiar trial. Like his great Master, "in that he himself suffered, being tempted, he was able to succor them that were tempted." In this department of ministerial duty he was eminently faithful and successful ; visiting from house to house ; exhorting, admonishing, reproving, comforting. As a preacher he was great, but greater as a pastor. The union of the two rendered his success in winning souls to Christ so remarkable.

He had a most happy faculty of conducting a religious conversation, leading the minds of those with whom he associated directly to the main object for which they ought to live. He made no visits of mere ceremony, nor was ever guilty of those witticisms and levities which are so destructive of ministerial usefulness, and are sometimes exercised and dignified by the title of—ministerial relaxations. He was never known

"To court a grin when he should woo a soul."

"The following imperfectly described encounter with a lawyer of Portland, who ranked among the first in the place for wealth, and was very fluent withal, will serve to show Mr. Payson's insight into character and his power to mold it to what form he pleased, and at the same time prove, what might be confirmed by many other instances, that his conquests were not confined to weak women and children.

"A lady who was the common friend of Mrs. Payson and the lawyer's wife was sojourning in the family of the latter. After the females of the respective families had interchanged several 'calls,' Mrs. — was desirous of receiving a formal visit from Mrs. Payson ; but to effect this, Mr. Payson must also be invited, and how to prevail with her husband to tender an invitation was the great difficulty. He had been accustomed to associate experimental religion with meanness, and of course felt or affected great contempt for Mr. Payson, as if it were impossible for a man of his religion to

be also a man of talents. He knew, by report, something of Mr. Payson's practice on such occasions, and, dreading to have his house the scene of what appeared to him a gloomy interview, resisted his wife's proposal as long as he could and retain the character of a gentleman. When he gave his consent, it was with the positive determination that Mr. Payson should not converse on religion, nor ask a blessing over his food, nor offer a prayer in his house. He collected his forces, and made his preparation, in conformity with this purpose, and, when the appointed day arrived, received his guests very pleasantly, and entered, at once, into animated conversation, determined, by obtruding his own favorite topics, to forestall the divine. It was not long before the latter discovered his object, and summoned his powers to defeat it. He plied them with that skill and address for which he was remarkable. Still, for some time, victory inclined to neither side, or to both alternately. The lawyer, not long before, had returned from Washington city, where he had spent several weeks on business at the supreme court of the United States. Mr. Payson instituted some inquiries respecting sundry personages there, and, among others, the chaplain of the house of representatives. The counselor had heard him perform the devotional services in that assembly. 'How did you like him?' 'Not at all. He appeared to have more regard to those around him than he did to his Maker.' Mr. Payson was very happy to see him recognize the distinction between praying to God and praying to be heard of men, and let fall a series of weighty observations on prayer, passing into a strain of remark which, without taking the form, had all the effect on the lawyer's conscience of a personal application. From a topic so unwelcome he strove to divert the conversation, and, every few minutes, would start something as wide from it as the east is from the west. But, as often as he wandered, his guest would, dexterously, and without violence, bring him back; and, as often as he was brought back, he would wander again. At length the trying moment which was to turn the scale arrived. The time for the evening repast had come; a servant had entered with the tea and its accompaniments; the master of the feast became unusually eloquent, resolved to engross the conversation, to hear no question or reply, to allow no interval for 'grace,' and to give no indication by the eye, the hand, or the lips, that he expected or wished for such a service. Just as the distribution was on the very point of commencing, Mr. Payson interposed the question, 'What writer has said the devil invented the fashion of *carrying around* tea to prevent a blessing being asked?' Our host felt himself 'cornered'; but, making a virtue of necessity, he promptly replied, 'I don't know what writer it is; but, if you please, we will foil the devil this time. Will you ask a blessing, sir?' A blessing, of course, was asked, and he brooked, as well as he could, this first certain defeat, still resolved not to sustain another by the offering of thanks on closing the repast. But in this, too, he was disappointed. By some well-timed sentiment of his reverend guest, he was brought into such a dilemma that he could not, without absolute rudeness, decline asking him to return thanks. And thus he contested every inch of his ground till the visit terminated. But at every step the minister proved too much for the lawyer. He sustained his character as a minister of religion, and gained his point in every thing; and that, too, with so admi-

rable a tact, in a way so natural and unconstrained, and with such respectful deference to his host, that the latter could not be displeased, except with himself. Mr. Payson not only acknowledged God on the reception of food, but read the Scriptures and prayed before separating from the family—and did it, too, *at the request of* the master, though this request was made, in every successive instance, in violation of a fixed purpose. The chagrin of this disappointment, however, eventually became the occasion of his greatest joy. His mind was never entirely at ease till he found peace in believing.”—*Memoir*, p. 243, seq.

With the high and the low, the ignorant and the educated, the rich and the poor, he was equally at home, and could discern the specific spiritual maladies of those he conversed with, and suggest the remedy with as much readiness and certainty as the skilful physician can those of bodily disease. And why should not every pastor, at least in some degree, be enabled to do the same? Studying sermons and preaching eloquently are not the whole, nor yet the most important of a minister's qualifications. One man in a thousand has the faculty of acquiring fame by his eloquence. Not one of the remaining nine hundred and ninety-nine, if called to labor in this vineyard by the great Head of the church, and imbued with his Spirit, but may become a faithful pastor, and secure the affection and love of all within the circle of his influence—a circle, under our economy, continually widening its diameter. Just as it is in the natural world, the things most essential, and which ought therefore to be the most desirable, are the most readily attained. Gold, and pearls, and precious stones are hidden in the bowels of the earth, or the depths of the ocean. A few, by toil and danger, may obtain them. On the other hand, water, that first of necessaries, flows spontaneously everywhere. Bread, the staff of life, and all the other kindly fruits of the earth, are within every one's reach who will put forth the hand of even moderate industry. God's benevolence to the children of men is most wonderfully displayed by the fact—to which there is scarcely an exception in the kingdoms of nature or of grace—the things most desirable are most easily obtained.

Mr. Payson was also remarkable for the regularity and method of his pastoral visits. We were going to say the *Methodism* of his visits; but it strikes us, that although the latter is a derivative from the former, it does not, in all cases, convey, as it ought, the same idea as its primitive. Soon after his settlement in Portland, he divided his whole charge into districts, and gave public notice of the time when each family might expect a visit from their minister. The result was, that in most instances he found the family at home; and, spending no time in idle gossip or unmeaning chitchat, he was enabled, in the short space of half an hour, to converse with each individual, to suggest hints for their spiritual improvement, to give advice adapted to the peculiar circumstances of each, and to lead the devotions at the family altar. This practice he continued until his health and strength failed him. No wonder he was popular, or that his memory among that people is even to this day like ointment poured forth; and where is the minister who, if so disposed, might not imitate him in this respect?

One of Mr. Payson's distinguishing peculiarities was the remark-

able spirit of prayer which he possessed. His public addresses to the throne of grace were models of excellence. Combining fervor with simplicity, and breathing in sublimest strains his wants and wishes into the ear of the Almighty, it seemed as if, like Moses of old, he was indeed permitted to hold converse with him face to face. "That, sir," said one of his constant hearers to a stranger visiting the church in which he officiated, soon after his death, "that, sir," pointing to the pulpit, "is the place where Payson—*prayed*." There was no part of his pulpit exercises which so forcibly struck the ear of strangers as his manner of addressing the throne of grace. Rich, varied, copious, and at the same time simple, and unadorned save with the sublimest thoughts and language of the sacred writers, he presented, in this exercise, a most striking contrast to that stiffness and formality so common among those who, to use his own language, instead of praying, "make a prayer." He has left a delightful essay, which, were it not for its length, we should copy, on the question, "What are the principal excellences which should be cultivated, and the defects which should be avoided, by ministers of the gospel, in the performance of their public devotional exercises?" We commend this essay to the study of the young minister, and regret the less that from its length we cannot copy it entire, because from the memoir before us we are enabled to gather the secret of his peculiar felicity in this part of divine service. It was by his uninterrupted daily *retired* practice that he became so skilful and prevailing a pleader with his God. The essay alluded to unfolds the theory; his closet, the practical secret of his greatness in this respect.

Another element of his character, to which we have indeed already briefly adverted, was the consistent uniformity of his conduct. He never forgot, under whatever circumstances he might be placed, that he was an ambassador for Christ. The most worldly minded stranger could not be in his company for ever so short a time without being aware that he was in the presence of a man of God. And in all this there was nothing like austerity, or any thing that at all savored of that pharisaic haughtiness which seems to say, Stand by, for I am holier than thou. It was a happy union of Christian humility always ready to impart, and a childlike docility ever willing to receive instruction. His eloquence in the pulpit spoke not more loudly, nor made deeper impressions upon the consciences of his hearers, than his conduct out of it. He appears to have been deeply imbued with the sentiment of a celebrated French prelate, whom, as we observe, he quotes upon one occasion. "In vain," says the author referred to, "in vain do we preach to our hearers. Our lives, of which they are witnesses, are, with the generality of men, the gospel; it is not what we declare in the house of God; it is what they see us practice in our general demeanor. They look upon the public ministry as a stage, designed for the display of exalted principles beyond the reach of human weakness; but they consider *our life* as the reality by which they are to be directed." "Should a physician," says Payson himself, in an address to his clerical brethren, "should a physician assure a number of his patients that their symptoms were highly alarming, and their diseases probably mortal, and then sit down and converse on trifling subjects with an air of quiet indifference or levity, what would be their inference from

his conduct? Would they not unavoidably conclude either that he did not really consider their situation as dangerous, or that he was grossly deficient in sensibility and in a proper regard to their feelings? So if our impenitent hearers see us, after solemnly assuring them from the pulpit that they are children of disobedience, children of wrath, and momentarily exposed to the most awful punishment, mingling in their society with an apparent unconsciousness of their situation; conversing with earnestness on secular affairs, and seldom or never introducing topics strictly religious, or embracing private opportunities to warn them of their danger, what must they suppose? If they reflect at all, must they not unavoidably conclude either that we do not believe their situation to be such as we have represented it, or that we are totally devoid, not only of benevolence, compassion, and religious sensibility, but even of the common feelings of humanity? It is needless to remark, that either conclusion would be far from producing favorable ideas of our sincerity, or ministerial faithfulness. If, then, we wish that such ideas should be entertained by our people, we must convince them by our conduct that we never forget our character, our duty, or their situation."

The lesson taught in the foregoing extract cannot be too forcibly inculcated, and must commend itself to the conscience of every faithful minister.

Mr. Payson's pastoral labors did not at all interfere with his pulpit duties. He was in the habit of preaching, or doing what was at least as laborious, six nights in a week. Some definite idea of the amount of these labors may be gathered from the fact, that he was confined, during the whole course of his ministry, to one and the same people, and that most of his sermons were written out at full length. This was not, indeed, his invariable practice, as he sometimes prepared in his study merely the outline of his discourses, and he has left, in a letter to a friend, this memorable observation: "I find that when any good is done, it is my extempore sermons which do it."

We had designed giving some extracts from the volumes of his sermons before us, but our limits forbid, and a few general observations upon the peculiarities of his style must bring this article to a close.

The discourses, it will be remembered, were not written for the press, but were selected from his manuscripts after his decease, and published for the benefit of his widow and children. They, of course, have none of them the advantage of the author's finishing polish. For ourselves, however, we confess they are the more valuable on this account. There is a freshness and a vigor about many of them, a directness of aim, and an apparently studied absence of ornament, that involuntarily remind the reader of the writings of Wesley. His favorite mode of dividing his subjects, and in which he excels, is what is termed that of continued application. Many of his discourses resemble throughout a continued and well directed fire from a battery of heavy artillery. All his sermons are remarkable, to a greater or less extent, for the unity of design by which they are characterized. In each of them he sets before his hearers one object, which is never lost sight of from the commencement to the close; and instead of frittering away his energy, and giving, in every sermon, an epitomized body of divinity, as the

manner of some is, he is satisfied to "make out what he takes in hand :" showing in different points of light, and corroborating by the strongest arguments, the specific doctrine of the text, or the peculiar topic under consideration. In his style there is none of the stateliness of Foster, the gorgeousness of Chalmers, the grandeur of Hall, or the magnificence of Watson ; and equally distant is it, on the other hand, from the ruggedness of Butler, the verbosity of Leighton, the dryness of Blair, and the egotism of Finney. His manner is easy, unrestrained, natural ; apparently more careful about what he says than how he says it ; not by any means destitute of ornament, but giving ample evidence that ornament is never introduced for its own sake. There are, to be sure, faults that may be discovered by the eye of the critic, and some that will not escape the casual reader,—verbal inaccuracies, trifling inelegances, complicated sentences. What then ? We are not in the humor to point them out. There are specks in the sun. To many of the doctrines advanced in the volumes before us we are, of course, opposed ; and the probability is, that we shall always be opposed ; but while we feel satisfied with the correctness of our own creed, we are perfectly willing that those who differ from us should be satisfied with theirs. It has never yet been our fortune to meet an individual converted from one to the other of the great divisions of the Christian family by the religious polemics of the day. We are willing patiently to await that hour when ourselves and our opponents shall no longer see through a glass darkly. We are content to differ *here*, because we know that *there* we shall see as we are seen, and know as we are known. Now we are distinguished by different names, ranged under various banners. Then there will be one fold and one Shepherd, and all the disciples shall be one with Christ as he is one with the Father.

From the London Quarterly Review.

ART. IV.—TYLER ON OATHS.

Oaths: their Origin, Nature, and History. By JAMES ENDELL TYLER, B.D., Rector of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, and late Fellow of Oriel College. London. 8vo. 1834.

MR. TYLER's book is the work of a good and conscientious man, who is more anxious to direct public attention to a very important subject than to offer any new views of his own. It is rather an historical sketch, not indeed very complete, of the practice of oaths, than a philosophical inquiry into their use and obligation. But he has collected some interesting materials from Puffendorf, Grotius, Heineccius, and other writers on the subject, and will probably have the satisfaction of finding that his work has at least contributed to promote discussion and inquiry.

Every one must be aware that the subject of oaths at the present moment requires very serious consideration. Englishmen cannot forget that, not many years back, the most sacred interests of this country were stripped of their ancient securities, and placed under the simple protection of an oath, as a sufficient safeguard—a safeguard which we know from experience has proved wholly futile and

useless. Still more recently charges have been made and repeated upon individuals, and upon bodies of great eminence—charges which, however they may be softened down by the courtesy of language, cannot amount to less than accusations of a grave offence against the most solemn obligations.

The administration, also, of oaths has been for many years, especially in this country, employed almost to an unlimited extent, as an instrument of the most important functions of government. It has been used to extort truth in judicial cases; to secure the performance of official duties; to exclude suspected parties from dangerous privileges, by acting as a test of their opinions; to maintain in societies great principles of conduct inviolate, by binding men down to the observance of them; and in a great number of cases almost to supply the place of a police establishment, and to prevent frauds on the revenue of the country by placing men in the dilemma of either criminating themselves, or risking the crime of perjury. The multitude of oaths imposed for these various purposes has at last startled and alarmed all right-thinking men, and every one ought to rejoice that inquiry is likely to be aroused. It is not merely the common interests of truth which are at stake. But men begin to feel; and when religious sanctions, and the name of the Deity, and not only his name but his judgments, and those judgments supposed by many to be administered with an immediate providential jealousy over every violation of his honor,—when such solemnities as these are forced into all the details of life, mixed up with its most trivial concerns, and hazarded in the mouths of the least religiously disposed of men, there is a danger and a guilt both in those who are tempted to irreverence, and those who tempt. "He that compelleth to swear," says Chrysostom, "is more to be punished than he who is compelled." They have experienced, what all men conversant with human nature soon discover, that the too frequent application of strong excitements is as deadening to the moral as it is to the physical sense; and that indifference to the obligations of religion has naturally followed an ill-regulated and prodigal appeal to them. Even where no such indifference has been openly professed, it has been found that oaths have often failed in securing the objects for which they were imposed, and that with bad men there is no possibility of framing any form of words from which an ingenuous special pleading may not contrive an evasion. And this evil is perhaps worse than the former, because with no less guilt of perjury there is less to shock us openly, and more to encourage imitation and secure impunity. The public mind is infinitely more corrupted by the triumph of subtle caviling over plain simple truth, than by an open defiance of principle, which can at once be exposed and punished.

Other feelings have probably conspired to raise a general clamor for the abolition of oaths. There may be men who still find them an obstacle, not indeed impassable, but still one which they would willingly remove, between themselves and the objects of ambition, which those oaths were established to guard. Even as evidences and relics of an exclusive system they are obnoxious to many. There are still more persons who object to them as memorials of religion, who profess reverence for the name of God that they may wholly exclude it from the dealings of mankind, and may empty

every social institution of the spirit which hallows it. And there are others, less godless in their views, but equally godless in their acts, who, detaching morality from religion, and making every individual responsible for his creed and his piety solely to his Maker, think that the world may be carried on upon a common worldly code of vice and virtue, and that every allusion to religion should be avoided as an indelicate, unauthorized intrusion upon the right of private conscience.

But however various the motives for demanding a change in our present system of oaths, it is quite clear that the system requires examination. And the fear is, lest this examination should be prejudiced or superficial, carried on, like most of our present criticisms on the institutions of past ages, in a conceited, discontented, or enthusiastic spirit, and ending not in the restoration of a system to its sound and healthy state, but in the entire destruction of it, as a punishment for its having been abused.

The administration of oaths in this country, as before remarked, has been long based upon fundamental principles of society, both political and religious. From the very nature of an oath we cannot alter it, without affecting public feeling on many vital questions both of society and of Christianity itself, without touching on subjects intimately connected with our highest interests—subjects on which we are at this crisis in the midst of a great revolution of opinion. In discussing these subjects, looking to the general tenor of our public acts, we see very little to guide us at present but views of expediency, vague plans of melioration, a desire to conciliate opponents, and a suspicion of the soundness of all maxims on which we have hitherto acted.

It indicates, indeed, little good sense or good feeling to speak of the age in which we live as wholly worse than those which preceded it, and we have no such intention. But, assuredly, thoughtlessness and conceit are the characteristics of the present times: and it is not too presumptuous to say of us, that while we have discarded the guidance of those old principles and instincts which governed almost unconsciously the movements of society in past days, we have not reached, and probably never shall reach, by our own independent reasonings, such a profound knowledge of ethical and political truths as will supply their place. There is every reason why we should listen with attention and gratitude to any suggestion of improvement, from whatever quarter it may proceed. But there are still weightier reasons why, especially in times like these, we should examine deeply every plan of change. We should look first candidly, and even favorably, at existing institutions, and endeavor to correct their defects, instead of wholly overturning them at once; and most of all, we never should perpetrate a change without going back to principles, and resting it on the first axioms of morals.

We propose, therefore, at present, to make a few observations on the theory of oaths, with reference to the fundamental laws of human nature on which they are or ought to be constructed; and feeling that the great want in all our present proceedings is deep and accurate thought, we will make no apology for endeavoring to treat the question not superficially.

Perhaps nearly all the difficulties with which the imposition of oaths is embarrassed at the present day arise from an indistinct

view of the nature of moral obligation, and this indistinctness arises from an ambiguity in the use of the word. To oblige is to tie, to bind down, to compel to a certain course of action. Thus we find the phenomena of the material world always following a regular undeviating course, and we say that they are under the obligation of certain laws. We infer the existence of the laws from the uniform obedience to them. We know nothing of any obliging power, except by the uniform success of the obligation. But in the moral world it is very different. In this there are two kinds of laws—*one which ought to oblige, the other which do oblige*—one which we learn and understand long before we obey their impulse: the other which we follow, even while we protest against their right to lead. The laws of reason, goodness, holiness, of duty in general, are of the former kind; the laws of pleasure, inclination, self-interest, or habit, are of the latter. Nothing, for instance, lays, in one sense, a stronger obligation upon men than the existence of a Deity—to love, honor, and obey him. Nothing, in reality, exerts over us so little practical influence, probably, till a very late period of life. If we use the term *obligatory* to express that which *ought* to oblige; and the term *obliging* to express that which *really does* oblige, the question will be much simplified. And an oath, to state the case abstractedly, may be defined as an attempt to enforce that which is obligatory in itself by something which is obliging—to make men do that which ought to be done, but will not be done for its own sake, by some secondary motive of which they are susceptible.

In looking, then, into the constitution of human nature, (and without such an examination all regulation of oaths must be hazardous and precarious,) it is clear that nature has provided for us two kinds of motives, prior and preparatory to those which will influence our conduct when the law of virtue is at last written in our hearts—two which do oblige us long before we are obliged by those which are in the highest degree obligatory. These two are, shame or an instinctive submission to other moral beings above us; self-interest or any regard to our own pleasure or pain. The former principle is most strong in generous, noble minds—the latter in the lowest and worst. It would be mere pedantry to refer to ethical authorities for the illustration of these positions, upon which all ethical systems are founded.

If we examine more closely the nature of this feeling of shame, or, to use a Latin word which expresses its character more clearly, of “*vereoundia*,” it comprises many distinct sensibilities. It implies regard for the opinion of others, the fear of injuring them, bashfulness, emulation, respect for superior power, humility, personal affection: it is, in short, in morals what faith is in religion—the grapple by which men, during the process of education and instruction, are retained under the moral influence of others until the love of virtue, for its own sake, has been infused into their mind. Personal authority is a very different thing from the authority of goodness; and the former must be employed to enforce the latter until the latter is made intelligible and has acquired a proper power of its own.

If this principle of shame is not employed, education (and education is a large word, comprising all the influence which is exerted on the minds whether of old or young) can only be conducted on the principle of administering selfish pleasures or pains. If a child

will not be guided to right by the love of his parent, or by instinctive submission to his teacher, or by respect for the opinion of his companion, he must be bribed or flogged into obedience. There is no other course open, because no other motives are provided by nature to influence his actions, but either the intrinsic beauty of goodness, as the last, or shame, or selfish interest, as the previous instruments of discipline.

Such being the case, it is evident that whenever men are to be bound down to a course of conduct which, though in itself good, and therefore intrinsically obligatory, they yet are incapable of liking or obeying, then one of these secondary motives must be employed; and no wise man will doubt to which he ought to have recourse. The lower, indeed, may be thought to succeed with bad men better than the higher; but applied to the better class of characters, it will not only fail to elevate, but will even deteriorate their nature. Treat men as incapable of self-respect, and their self-respect will soon be destroyed; accustom them only to mean motives, and mean motives will soon become their only rule.

And there are many other considerations which render shame, as a motive, preferable to self-interest. It extends to the thoughts and hearts as well as to external actions. Though a virtue of an inferior class, it is in itself a virtue, and therefore encourages the growth of other virtues, instead of extinguishing them. It is one of the first sensibilities awakened, and nearly the last wholly lost; and where it is lost, as all reformation is hopeless, such cases can never into calculation. Men are not to regulate their laws or their discipline by their probable effect upon the wholly bad, who are beyond all influence, but upon the imperfectly good, who may be yet saved. These are the proper objects of wise legislation in man, as they are the objects of God's providence in nature.

One way, then, in which the principle of shame is brought to bear upon the moral government of men, is the exclusion of temptation, by keeping before them constantly persons, and personal influences, in the presence of which neither vicious actions can be indulged, nor vicious thoughts intrude. Thus children are kept under the eye of their parents. Public opinion is a perpetual check upon many profligate tendencies. The light of day prohibits many things which are shamelessly committed in darkness. Thus the looks, language, censures, or approbation of our fellow-creatures insensibly guide and control our opinions as well as conduct. Thus a high standard of moral feeling in one class soon operates upon others. The mere presence of good men makes others good. The very sight of places, things, buildings, or objects hallowed by the personal character of other moral beings, keeps guard upon the sanctuary of the heart, and prevents the entrance of evil.

In one word, there is a moral power in the world, unseen, indeed, but not unfelt, which is hourly guiding us all, in the beautiful expression of Scripture, "not by bit or bridle," that is, by the rough impulses of pain or pleasure, "but by the eye," by the secret movement of its approbation or censure.

In another way this power acts, like other discipline, by its punishments and rewards; and, like all forms of government, by punishment much more than by reward. It follows up the offender,

and administers a discipline infinitely more severe than any chastisement which can be inflicted by a mere physical power.

But there is a third way which is adopted when it is impossible to maintain a visible or sensible moral influence always standing by the side of man's frailty, and acting as an immediate keeper upon his heart—adopted when he must be left to himself and be removed from every check but a law within his conscience. To provide him with this law and this check, *promises* are enforced, of which the whole obliging force may be traced to the principle of shame. And as an oath is a religious obligation of some kind or another, superinduced upon a promise, the true nature and conditions of *promises* must form a preliminary question in every discussion upon oaths.

In the first place, then, a promise, however it may practically *oblige*, can in no way affect the intrinsic *obligatory* character of the act promised. If the act be bad, the promise cannot make it good. If it be good, it ought to be performed, whether or not it is coupled with any previous pledge. The security which is given for a debt may, indeed, strengthen the confidence of the creditor, and give punctuality to the debtor, but it does not alter the nature of the debt. It is therefore the obliging nature of a promise which is to be analyzed. How does it act upon secondary feelings and motives before the first and highest are developed? These feelings are not simple, but very complicated.

One is that tremulous, sensitive susceptibility of impressions from other minds by which all men not very practiced in deceit, or hardened, acknowledge the presence of a superior being, whether man or God, by which they fall unconsciously into the position which he commands; are thrown off their guard, and so prevented from practicing hypocrisy; are incapable of continuing any double mindedness; and still more incapable of uttering words at variance with their thoughts. The power of the human eye over even bad men arises from this law. The effect may be produced in part by an admonition, or by any one of those moral influences which rise in a graduated scale from the first secret voice of conscience up to the most awful imprecatory oaths imposed under the most appalling circumstances. But the utterance of words, or any external act of the party to be influenced, not only brings him under this influence, but effects something more. It is a test that his mind is affected as it should be, and also has a tendency to affect it, just as the posture of kneeling not only evinces the disposition, but positively disposes us to pray. Once fix on the mind, though only for a space, a right intention, and something is done to insure its accomplishment: the aim is taken, the wheel is set on the tram-road. And thus a promise is obliging, in the first place, by giving this intention and direction to the thoughts and feelings of the moment.

Secondly. If exacted with formality and deliberation, and especially if recorded in some shape which may serve as a permanent memorial, it keeps the same intention constantly before the eyes, and fixes it more deeply. Hence signatures to writing, monuments of treaties, tokens and symbols of vows and engagements. They oblige by constantly renewing the original impression and assisting the memory.

Thirdly. A promise renders man in a remarkable way susceptible of shame by placing him at once in an elevated relation to other

moral beings and to himself, from which he fears to fall. Instead of lying passive, and merely witnessing examples, listening to admonitions, or submitting to punishment from others, he is by a promise roused up to a consciousness of his own free agency, his own power, and his own responsibility; for a promise is a voluntary surrender of some portion of our liberty of action. It therefore necessarily implies that liberty, and, consequently, a corresponding amount of independence. The making of a promise for the first time is, therefore, a very important era, and exerts a very important influence on our moral development. It is the coming of age of a moral being. So long as he is kept in his minority, subject only to the lash, with the whole burden both of his virtues and vices thrown upon his guardians, so long he is very slightly susceptible of shame: slightly, in his own eyes, because he never exercises reflection, or arraigns himself before his own conscience, or recalls a former state more elevated than the present—slightly, in the eyes of others, because he is accustomed to consider them, and not himself, responsible for his conduct. And as they have never treated him as an equal, it is no degradation to be lightly esteemed by them. But admit men to promise, and you deal with them as independent beings—you abdicate a portion of your own power over them, and convert their previous subjection into a voluntary and far more ennobling compact; you place them on a high position in *your eyes*, from which they fear to fall; and you raise them in their own eyes, not only in this way, but by compelling thought, deliberation, and forethought, previous to a binding engagement. This, when it can safely be practiced, is the great object of education, as it is of civil government, and appears to have been studiously practiced in all the dealings of God to man, which have been uniformly carried on from the beginning, and in a very extraordinary way, by covenant and compact, as between free, independent agents, not as the overruling of a creature by an absolute lord and master.

Thus our desire of retaining the good opinion of others, a desire which exists in the fullest vigor in almost every mind, long before we are even sensible of a law of abstract goodness, is brought to bear in support of that law. And happily its influence has full scope, because other men, also, are peculiarly alive to what is called a law of honor long before they recognize the right of other virtues. The infraction of a promise solemnly made lowers men in the eyes of the world far more than the violation of many other duties. If it were not so, the feeling of shame would not exist in all its present keenness to warn us against the infraction.

One more mode in which, very often, a promise obliges, is by involving the positive interests of others in our fulfilment of it. It seldom happens that a promise is exacted without the party hazarding upon the strength of it some advantage which might otherwise have been legally retained. And men are very sensible to the rights, and still more to the wrongs of others, at a very early age, and even when they are under the influence of passions. It is, like shame, one of the last good feelings which are obliterated—one of the first which come forth. He must be a very bad man who would not be in some measure deterred from an evil action by remembering that it must injure another who had rendered himself thus liable to injury by a voluntary act of confidence. But if no promise is given, no

confidence is reposed, no responsibility is therefore incurred, and no remorse is felt.

The same observation may be extended to cases where favors have been conferred upon the strength of an engagement, though without any positive detriment to the party who confers them, arising from the violation of the compact. Gratitude is itself a very early, and very strong, and very lasting secondary feeling, and possesses a very obliging and stringent power.

And thus far a promise serves to bind us down to a course of conduct, simply by appealing forcibly to the principle of shame, or, in other words, to our moral susceptibility of influence from the presence of other moral beings. There might be added to this the vague but certain apprehension of evil arising from the loss of respect and confidence. But in the present view of an oath this is an accident, not an object, and we wish to draw the line of distinction broadly and clearly between promises which bind by a moral feeling, and those which bind by fear, and are in some shape or another imprecatory. And it will very much assist our view if we trace briefly the stages through which a simple promise passed into an imprecatory oath.

A very large portion of the oaths which occur, particularly in ancient history, convey no trace of imprecation; they are simply the mention of some object, either thing or person, the presence of which, from its dignity or influence, it was supposed would produce the moral effects above mentioned, would reduce the mind to seriousness, simplicity, and awe, and would therefore ensure the truth. Oaths such as these,—‘per Deos, per venerationem principis, per timorem patris sui, per cineres suorum, per salem, per stellas, per nomen imperatoris, per membra carorum, per tenebras, per noctem, per barbam, per dextram, per caput alterius, per fortunam suam et gloriam; per horrendum hoc diluvium, per animas avorum et proavorum;—or in the Mohammedan practice,—per Angelorum ordines, per Alcoranum, per ventos, per nubes, per librum lineariter in chartis subtilissime scriptum;—or in the Christian practice,—per altare, per Evangelium, per nomen vel reliquias Sanctorum’—without collecting more instances from various writers, these all appeal to the same principle of shame, that is, of reverential feeling to some object, the very thought of which was to exclude the inclination to falsehood. To add to the effect, the object itself was very often brought forward, and the repetition of the words was accompanied by a corporal act. Thus the northern nations swore sometimes brandishing their spears, sometimes on a drawn sword, sometimes clasping the robe of the person who exacted the oath; sometimes holding a piece of coin which bore the king’s effigy. Selden mentions a practice in London of swearing on the tomb of the dead, when a witness had died without giving his testimony. The laws of Hoel the Good speak of the same practice applied in the case of deceased debtors. Du Fresne speaks of a Danish king whose armlet was so used. According to Gyraldus, the Irish swore upon the crosiers of their bishops. So the oath was taken by Christians, sometimes touching the gospel, sometimes the altar, sometimes the relics of saints, sometimes with the cross laid on their head. Sometimes in monasteries they touched the feet of the abbot. In India they touch the feet of the Brahmin. In the middle ages, it was no

uncommon thing to lay the hand on the head of the party who received the oath. And the forms of laying the hand on the heart, or of stretching the arms out, were intended for the same purpose. Actions were chosen to express the oath, as being supposed to imply more sincerity, to require more deliberation, and to impress the mind more strongly than mere words; and very frequently the oath was repeated at several times, in the presence of fixed numbers, before several altars, or over accumulated relics, in order to increase the reverential feeling. As Mr. Tyler observes, the expression of a *corporal oath* comes from this practice.

Now it is evident, that the use of inanimate things as fit objects of reverential awe is not only mere folly and superstition, but is a heavy offence against the first principles of ethics. It is a species of moral idolatry—and no one will now defend it. And yet men are found to demand that human creatures should be thus employed; and promises be sanctioned and enforced by the respect felt to man alone, without any reference whatever to the only legitimate Source of all obligation—the only Being whom men ought to fear. They will admit of promises, but will not allow them to be sanctioned by the name of God, as made in his presence, and binding by his will. A few words will show at once the mischief of such a theory, and the principles upon which, with the consent of the church, promises in the middle ages were so generally raised into oaths—but oaths without imprecation.

It is evident that if truth is to be enforced by the eye, and the presence of any one, no being can be so able or so fit to enforce it as the Source of all truth. If any one is to be placed before us as the supreme object of our fear and respect, it must be God. Whether we swear by stocks and stones or by human beings, (which, in fact, is done when a promise or declaration is made in the presence of man alone,) in each case there is the same detraction from the sole right of God. And this cannot be admitted by the legislature without most evil consequences; for in the moral government of men, while motives which, in their imperfect state, they can feel and understand, are applied to make them act, great care must at the same time be taken to suggest others, which may place the action upon the right ground—to name at least the motives which *ought* to bind as a corrective of the motive which *does* bind. When a child is flogged to deter him from misconduct, he should always be informed that obedience to God, not the fear of being flogged, should be his real inducement to do right. When a man binds himself by a law of honor, though the obligation may be accepted, he should always be reminded that the command of God, not the opinion of man, is the real standard of right and wrong. If this is not done, in a very short time the low immature views of common minds will universally prevail. Men will consider that acquiescence in their notion of obligation is a proof of its correctness; they will have no better and truer rule placed before their eyes; and the fundamental principles of morality will, in a very short time, be overlaid and lost. For this reason, a promise to man ought always to be connected with the thought of God, to whom every act of goodness is due—obedience to whom constitutes the measure of all goodness—with-out reference to whom all our faith, and reverence, and honesty, and truth to man, is but a species of vice. What must be the

language of any right-thinking Christian to a person who, on a solemn occasion, offers to bind himself by a promise, as one human creature to another, without any reference to their Creator? "You acknowledge," he would surely say, "respect for my opinion—you fear to tell me a falsehood—you are ashamed to deceive, or dissemble, or disappoint me in the eyes of the world—you own that the right which I obtain by your present engagement cannot be withheld or violated without injustice:—is there not another moral Being for whom you are bound to feel respect indeed—in whose presence you can still less dare to lie, or to deceive—who has a right to all your actions—and from whom all my rights are derived? Can you offend against me, without offending against Him? Is He not as much a party to every engagement that man can make, as the visible covenanters themselves? Will He not avenge your faithlessness, even though no direct appeal be made to Him—even though you cast His name aside, as if you could possibly prevent Him from being a witness to your compact and your fraud?" Surely the attempt which men are now making quietly to put away the name of God from those very affairs of life where his presence and sanction are most needed, is an alarming proof of either our thoughtlessness or our ungodliness. Surely those generations were far wiser who endeavored, however vainly, to make it hallow every action, and reminded man, at every entrance upon a duty to his neighbor, that it was also and chiefly a duty to his Maker.

It was undoubtedly upon this principle that from the fifth century downward, oaths, and chiefly official oaths, were so multiplied within the church. An ecclesiastical, if not a purely religious spirit, had penetrated the whole of society; and whenever a duty was to be performed, it was directed to the one great Centre of all obligation. And although there may be something to censure in the occasions or forms of these oaths, the principle was wise. It was only stating, and making others state in form, what the early Christians recognized as the great axiom of all morality—and an axiom which, if they refused to state in the shape of an oath, they refused only because they would not permit the slightest distrust of their holding it—"We swear," said the old fathers, "by our lives, not by our lips. We make God the great object of all our thoughts, and the rule of all our actions. If, therefore, we make a promise, it is to God—if we keep it, it is because we dare not break an engagement which was made in his presence; but we do not make mention of his name, because it is not required. It is written in our hearts, and borne publicly before all our deeds." When this high spirit began to cease, then oaths commenced, just as law and precept enter in only with suspicion and wrong. And as the suspicion and wrongs increased, men ceased to feel confidence in the simple principle of *shame*, and recurred to *fear*—the lowest and the worst, and with good men the most deteriorating motive.

Imprecatory oaths were the only security of promises in heathenism; and as the principles of heathenism gradually re-established themselves in the bosom of Romanism, imprecatory oaths revived with the corruptions of the church. They were founded on several distinct notions, which perhaps more properly may be called superstitions, though superstition is a hard word, and in the present day is far too lightly used. It may be worth while to mention them.

1. Men have always attributed a powerful, and, as it were, a sacramental influence to words. The omens of heathens, and the prophetic character which they often traced in the imposition of names, flowed from this notion. And thus a curse was supposed to carry with it its own completion, even without any reference to a providential execution of it by God.

2. They considered that the party called in to witness the oath became at once personally interested in the maintenance of it, and that God would thus avenge its violation with the same feeling which the party would feel who imposed it. Even now, when a common person is subpœnaed to give evidence in a trial, he immediately identifies himself with the cause which he supports, and enters fully as deeply as the principals into its failure or success.

3. They felt, and felt truly, that deceit is an insult to the person in whose presence it is practised, and the more so in proportion as the person is acquainted with the truth; and a falsehood therefore, in the presence of God, was supposed to draw down his peculiar and immediate vengeance.

4. And they rested the practice of purgation, even in its worst abuses, upon the original truth, of the peril which ensues on the unworthy reception of the communion. Thus the consecration of the elements was considered at one time a sufficient proof of a priest's innocence: then the reception of them with impunity was held a valid purgation. Then when relics became common, they were constantly appealed to, as possessing similar power of detecting and punishing perjury. And lastly, the exorcism and benediction of the priest were supposed to convey the same power to wine, water, or even a morsel of bread, as in the case of the ordeal.

Upon these principles the system of imprecatory oaths was introduced to a most frightful extent. The Church at first strongly remonstrated against them, but at length acquiesced, though partially, and still with endeavors to obviate the mischief. The blind power of the imprecation was considered so resistless and inevitable, that any object named in the oath was rendered obnoxious to the curse. It was delivered up as a pledge, or hostage. "You swear," says Chrysostom, "without a thought, by the name of God; yet you would not dare to utter an oath by the head of your child." Instead of naming objects as things regarded with a reverential feeling, and therefore proving by their presence in the thought, that the mind itself was affected with a solemn, serious, truth-speaking spirit, men named them as so many pledges on which the curse from Heaven was to fall if the promise were broken. The whole process of this transaction is highly interesting; but to illustrate it step by step would lead us far beyond our present purpose. Du Cange, Spelman, and Hoffman have collected large materials for such a work; the Anglo-Saxon laws also throw much light on the question, and the homilies of Chrysostom and early chronicles should also be consulted.

It is, however, not the historical facts with which we are at present chiefly concerned, but the end to which they may be traced.—This end was the re-establishment of the heathen imprecatory oath in all its evils. And there can be little hesitation in asserting, that imprecatory oaths, under whatever shape, is a positive sin, both in the party who takes, and still more in the party who imposes them.

In this point we most cordially agree with Mr. Tyler. Puffendorf, indeed, and Paley, and heathen moralists in general, recognize them by their very definitions; but on ethical questions of the higher order Paley is very poor authority. Heathens were placed in an entirely different position from that of Christians, and if an oath with them was to bind at all, it could bind by imprecation alone. Puffendorf is, indeed, a great name; but he speaks hesitatingly, and rather treats of oaths as they are, than as they should be constituted.

If the imprecation be supposed to draw down the curse, as by a sort of physical irrespective law, it cannot be other than a sin to hazard the dearest interests of any one on that which must at best be exposed to chance, the strict maintenance of a promise. It is not for man to attach even to crime punishment beyond the range of his own power of infliction. No merciful spirit would permit a sinful man to tempt God's chastisement, or would place him in a position where, if he fell, it must be into utter ruin. And if the notion of imprecation is so modified as to leave no other check in the oath but the sense of God's presence, and the consciousness of his general anger and punishment upon falsehood, all this is maintained sufficiently by the ordinary form of swearing without any imprecation whatever.

Under any view of an imprecation, it is a most serious evil. It appeals to a wrong motive; it treats man as insensible to all but the lowest principles, at the very time when, by the very necessity of imposing the oath, he is supposed to be placed in a position where confidence is reposed in him. It exhibits a spirit suspicious, vindictive, and superstitious on the part of the imposer; rash and profane on the part of the swearer; and it is wholly alien to the pure, forgiving, humble, awful piety of a Christian. If there is any thing in the form of our present oath at all approaching to it, (we think there is not,) it ought to be removed. Some progress has already been made by an improved tone of Christianity in cutting off many gross and frightful abuses of the application of the principle of fear to extort truth. Torture was the worst instance; but the oaths which have been at times administered under circumstances studiously arranged to produce, not solemnity of feeling, but terror and alarm, all fall under the same censure. The effect, while it continues, is confined to the feelings, vanishes by repetition, and consists of external impressions. It acts upon wrong feelings also, and departs as soon as the mind is allowed to return to its natural state. None but the bad are fit subjects for it, and the bad will soon escape from its influence.

The first principle, then, in the theory of oaths is, that all imprecation must be removed. The second is, that in any circumstances in which a promise can be rightly executed and rightly given, if the promise is to take a solemn and stringent form, it must be made a religious promise, that is, an oath.

Much, indeed, of all this reasoning, and especially of what has been urged with respect to the elevating influence of a promise rightly exacted, will sound like mere theory to those who take what is called a practical view of things—that is, who estimate human nature at its very lowest price—deal with it as incapable of any better sentiment, and would reduce all thought and all laws to the most degraded level of the world, instead of raising above it some

high standard and rule, which may succeed in drawing up to itself all the minds capable of such attraction, even if it fail to act upon the worst. But it may be remembered that reason, and law, and society, and religion—that man in his best of forms, and nature, and God, all govern and make us good by theories: that is, by views of perfection and principles of conduct beyond our common practice, and nobler than ignoble men can understand or follow. We may as well wish the heavens to be withdrawn, and the earth to be left bare to itself, with no enlightening atmosphere and no invigorating sun, as demand that high theories of duty and of truth be cast out of sight as impracticable, and men be abandoned to their own instinct, stripped of their power of vision, and of penetrating into a region above them.

And when, bit by bit, as the practice of the day proposes, these theories have been cut off and cast aside, we shall then find, to our grievous cost, how many secret influences for good have been destroyed with them— influences which rarely forced themselves upon our consciousness, but still molded and inspired our minds in the same quiet, silent process by which all God's works are completed, by which the tree springs forth from the seed, and the man grows up from the infant, nurtured, not with the gross elements of matter, but with something impalpable to sense, which nature herself has hidden in them.

From this digression, however, let us return to several corollaries which may be drawn respecting the circumstances under which an oath may be or may not be enforced. It is a subject of too much magnitude and delicacy to be spoken on broadly and sweepingly without much care, and it is therefore better to state the most important principles as questions than as demonstrated truths.

I. Is there any justification for voluntary oaths? Mr. Tyler speaks strongly against them, and all reason seems to sanction their recent abolition by the legislature. Under this head, indeed, are not to be included all the strong expressions of a Christian solemnly appealing to God in his sincerity and innocence, such as occur frequently in the Scriptures and in the history of the primitive church; but such as are gratuitously and formally proffered for the purpose of either confirming the belief of others, or of strengthening our own resolution against temptation. Of the former head, Mr. Tyler mentions, as a fact, on the authority of a police magistrate, that persons in the metropolis often used to come together in crowds to swear to the loss of pawnbrokers' duplicates. The latter kind are vows. For instance, it is not uncommon for ignorant men to bind themselves by an oath against drunkenness, or any other particular vice. The former class are objectionable for a reason which will occur hereafter; they are taken from a sense of interest, and therefore with a strong temptation to falsehood. In the latter case, the oaths are adopted as an additional bulwark to the weakness of our own resolutions, and they are becoming common. To attain this object, the oath must assume a very solemn and binding character. It is otherwise useless, and worse than useless; for its failure leaves us in a much worse condition, morally speaking, than we were in before. And this point may deserve to be enlarged on, because the observations will apply generally to the evil effects of multiplying oaths, and resting on them the chief stress of moral obligation. The whole

course, indeed, of our moral improvement is a series of efforts carried on partly by internal struggles against present temptation, and partly by the aid of outward impulses and obligations; and it is not possible that these efforts should not be interrupted by constant failures. Sometimes our own principles are too weak to support us; sometimes the external aids fail us, such as the sanctity of the place, the presence of others, the probability of punishment, or the absence of immediate temptation. But there is a wide difference between the failure of the internal principle, which must happen constantly in all men, however anxiously struggling to do right, and a failure in the external circumstance on which we rested our hope of perseverance. When men walk without a staff they may indeed fall from weakness or from accident, but every fall will rouse them to more independent exertion of their personal strength; but when we lean wholly on a foreign support, and this gives way, we are left without the habit of exertion, and therefore without hope.

It is thus that the practice of strengthening our moral resolution by solemn vows is so dangerous. Instead of exciting us to constant watchfulness, and preserving the mind in that state of humble, diligent, self-distrusting energy which is the only real security for the virtuous principle, they throw it upon the support of an outward impression, which is to overpower our internal tendencies mechanically and irresistibly. They rest it upon a staff which must break, because no outward impression is able, or is intended by nature, to supply the place of the true moral power within. Every one in his own experience may find abundant instances of the deceitfulness of all such props to virtue, and observe how often he has said to himself, "If I were in such a position, surrounded by such and such objects, or laid under such and such obligations, I should abstain from wrong;" and how often, when these very obligations have been laid upon him, he has been wholly unconscious of their influence!

Not only this, but their failure inflicts a blow upon the conscience dangerous in proportion to the solemnity of the supposed obligation and to our misplaced confidence in them. A man endeavors to bind himself to the discharge of a duty by thinking on the real external relations which are intended to secure his virtue, that is, on his relations as a Christian. And though he may fail afterward, there has been an exercise of the virtuous principle which may ripen into a habit; there is something to encourage future attempts; the attention is directed to the right point; some success is sure to attend the effort; and thoughts and feelings, however faint and vague, have been once brought before the mind, ready to return again with greater distinctness and power. And what is most of all, we are taught by the failure where the defect lies, and by the previous effort where we are to look to supply it. Every fault following upon such a struggle proves the weakness of our own heart, and every such struggle to think upon our position as Christians brings more clearly before us the promise which has been given of assistance. There is, indeed, a wound to the conscience by every failure of a good resolution. But if the resolution has been supported on the right ground, it will carry with it hopes, and promises, and comforts to remedy the evil.

But when, on the contrary, a man has attempted to prop and

bolster up his virtue by any false aids whatever, there will be, in proportion to the awfulness of the seeming obligation, a deeper sense of guilt and greater despair when it fails—a sense of guilt without a promise of forgiveness, and a despair without a hope of obtaining any stronger assistance. The wound in such cases is irreparable, and the danger great of falling into recklessness.

II. May not all assertory oaths, with the exception, perhaps, of certain extreme cases, be also abolished? This head does not include oaths taken by witnesses in courts of law, for these may perhaps be considered as promissory, and as applying to the future. The only object of an assertory oath is to strengthen the belief of the party who imposes or accepts it. Now it is evident that when any temptation exists to deceive, and when the notion of imprecation is removed, the assertion of the interested party, though given with the greatest solemnity, is the very last and lowest evidence of his truth. So long as any trace of the fact can be found either in the character of the individual, or in the consistency of his story, in witnesses, in effects, so long we are logically bound to test his statement by these. It is only in the entire absence of all external or collateral proof that he can be admitted to witness himself. Now if on a review of all circumstances suspicion still exists, it will exist after the oath is taken. We may, indeed, in some degree, excuse our Anglo-Saxon ancestors for recurring to purgation as a test of innocence, because at that time their state was not sufficiently developed to undertake the charge of preventing, detecting, and punishing crime. Each man was placed under the superintendence of his neighbor, and therefore it was as necessary for him to live free from suspicion as from punishment. And this was the origin of the very remarkable system of purgation by oath, compurgation, and the ordeal. But with us the case is different. "We have no right," says Chrysostom repeatedly, "to distrust, and none to compel another man to remove our distrust by a process which is irreverent to God and a temptation to himself." Assertory oaths are, indeed, the principal object of the remonstrances and prohibitions of the early church. In one case, indeed, under the Levitical law, God seems to have indulged the natural distrustfulness of men. And in the case of jealousy he promised to interpose with a miracle, not so much to clear the accused wife as to enable the husband to receive her again with that confidence which is essential to affection. But this was peculiarly a case in which all other evidence would probably be beyond the reach of man, and satisfaction was most necessary both to the accuser and the accused. It affords no precedent whatever for assertory oaths under present circumstances. We throw out, however, such a suggestion with great diffidence, as one requiring considerable thought. One observation may be added, that, as a test of opinions, an oath is peculiarly objectionable, because it must be stated in very comprehensive words, and therefore must open great latitude to equivocation. An act is infinitely better. And there are very few cases in which a test of opinions is required, where some far better evidence may not be found than the compulsory declaration of the party himself.

III. An oath should not be imposed where no such obligation is necessary, especially not on good men, nor on persons officially supposed to be placed beyond the temptation to do wrong. It is a

lower obligation, and to employ it is an insult when the higher is fairly supposed to exist. On this principle the early church properly prohibited the clergy from taking oaths. Their word was sufficient, and there was no necessity to add the religious sanction to men dedicated to religion.

IV. As the enforcement of a promise supposes that a man is not sufficiently alive to the intrinsic obligation of goodness, and as its formal expression as an oath implies that he may also be naturally insensible to the paramount duty of religion, it is necessary in each case that the secondary obligation be impressed upon his mind by solemnity in administering the oath; that his sense of awe, and shame, and devotion, however vague, be roused by publicity, admonition, or explanation, or preparation of some kind; and that it be recorded and kept before his eyes constantly, if possible. In all these points the administration of oaths in this country has been lamentably and criminally defective. And from this neglect have arisen chiefly the present efforts to abolish them altogether, and the mistakes as to their real value.

V. The occasions on which an oath is enforced should be rare, because it is addressed to imperfect minds; it is an appeal to feelings rather than principles, and therefore works on springs, not like the highest motives to virtue, strengthening with their daily use, but, like all other secondary excitements, liable to exhaustion and decay. Shame is perhaps the most delicate and perishable principle within us; very strong while it lasts, and lasting while it is not used too freely, but vanishing rapidly when trespassed on too roughly. Men cannot be roused too frequently to act, but they can be made to feel far too often, until the feeling is dead.

VI. As the occasions are rare, so they should be connected with some elevating and religious thoughts. Not that the name of God is profaned, as men now assert, by common use. If it were so, it would be profaned every hour in the heart and the lips of every good man. Nor that it is profaned by employment on trivial occasions, for nothing is too small to be consecrated to some high purpose of morality or religion. But it is profaned when we use it, as in the administration of oaths is too frequently done, for bad or idle purposes, for some selfish object, to save the trouble of patient investigation, to relieve ourselves from the responsibility of rightful superintendence, to remove unjustifiable doubts, or to confirm frivolous statements. From not discriminating between these and purposes strictly good, men have been accustomed to speak of many official oaths, particularly those taken by inferior officers in the universities and in certain other public bodies, as frivolous profanations of the name of God to menial and ludicrous ends; not remembering that the old system of domestic servitude under the influence of the church was at one time placed, throughout its whole extent, upon the basis of a religious relation, and consecrated by oaths;—nor that a university, as a peculiarly religious institution, retains the same system, and binds all her members by a religious obligation to discharge their several duties; nor, lastly, that although externally the office of a clerk of the market may have far less dignity to the eye than the office of vice-chancellor, each in his own station has temptations as strong to resist; exercises precisely the same principles in discharging his trust faithfully; requires precisely

the same views and obligations to raise and support him; is, as a moral agent, on exactly the same level, whether his fidelity is shown in fixing the price of meat, or enforcing the statutes. This, however, is but another instance of our want of vision.

VII. The occasions must be such as to require a promise; that is, when either it is impossible to enforce, without it, the proper administration of a responsible power, or from any reasons it is desirable to leave a trust in irresponsible hands, unfettered by too many external restrictions; and this latter may be the case, either from a wish to allow opportunities for the exercise of moral agency, or from the necessity of establishing a principle of equity in a man's own conscience, to modify, as unforeseen exigencies may require, the strict written law, so that the latter may not destroy the spirit, nor the necessity of consulting the spirit open too wide a door for the innovation of personal caprice.

VIII. The impositions of oaths must be superintended and checked by competent authority, lest bad men should abuse their seeming and real obligation to the injury of weak minds.

IX. They should not be enforced upon the bad, because they are then futile and possess no binding power, and the violation of them brings additional guilt upon the perjurer, destroys the sanctity of an oath in the eyes of others, and in the absence of immediate retribution raises doubts of a moral government above us. Some classes of men are excluded by our laws from giving evidence; and it might, perhaps, be desirable if, instead of indiscriminately compelling all witnesses to swear, an admonition were substituted, and the oath reserved for particular occasions, at the discretion of the judge. This would at once remove one of the greatest blots in our system of oaths, arising from the notorious perjuries in some of the courts of the metropolis.

X. Upon the same principle they are highly objectionable when a strong temptation exists to violate them, either openly or by sophistry. The exact proportion of external obligation which it is expedient to lay upon the conscience is one of the most delicate problems in moral government. It must be measured with reference to the amount of strength in the internal principle of virtue, and must assist, encourage, and, as it were, provoke it to higher efforts; but not to efforts wholly beyond its reach, for fear of the consequences of failure. In this point of view, considering the tenets, nature, and position of the Romish Church, few men will doubt that whatever criminality attaches to the violation of the emancipation oath, no little culpability is fixed upon those who imposed it. And it would, perhaps, be more consonant with true ethical and political wisdom, and with the dignity of the legislature, and less destructive to national morality, and the consciences of the offending parties themselves, if the oath were now abolished, since it was found to be openly transgressed, and the legislature has not courage enough, or honor, to punish the transgression as it deserves.

XI. We come now to the last condition, which has been before our eyes in the previous questions, and which has assumed a very prominent position from late discussions in the legislature, and still later regulations in both the universities of England.

It is stated, and stated truly, that neither promise nor oath should be enforced to bind men to things illegal or impracticable. And

stated in a general form, the principle is self-evident. But there is in the words "impracticable and illegal" more than one ambiguity, which are likely to cause great mischief, if indeed the mischief is not done already. The decisions, on this point, of casuists, and principally of Catholic Christian authorities, (for we are treating the subject of oaths as Christians, and not as heathens,) may be briefly stated; and it will be seen that they include what is very important, the true theory of a dispensing power.

In the first place, a distinction must be drawn between cases where an illegality or impossibility *is known* to exist at the time when the oath is imposed, and when it is either made known or is created *subsequently*. In the former case we use the words of Augustin, (Epist. 125.) "Even if death be threatened, a Christian ought rather to die than swear to that which he cannot or ought not to perform." And an oath which cannot be rightfully taken, of course cannot be rightfully imposed. Upon the same principle rash oaths, or general promises, made thoughtlessly, which may chance to place us in the position of doing an illegal act, without any power of dispensation, "salvà conscientia," are also highly culpable. To risk a sin is the next sin to its positive commission.

But the case in which the impracticability of an oath becomes known *after it has* been taken requires more discrimination. It must be obvious that scarcely a single promise can be made relating to future time, or in the slightest degree connected with the contingencies of human life, in which it is not possible for such a subsequent discovery to be made. We are ignorant, and must be ignorant, even after every precaution of inquiry, not only of the extent of our physical power, but of many human and even moral and divine laws. We cannot see all the remote relations in which we stand, and may stand—cannot calculate chances—cannot arrest the movements of others, or fix the conditions of our conduct—cannot foresee, or state, or provide for the hundredth part of the cases which may occur, to qualify, render void or impracticable the laws under which we propose to act. In compacts and covenants, as in every other duty of life, we must act, if we act at all, in sincerity and honesty of heart, but in very great blindness of understanding. And if we are not to act till mathematical certainty is attained, we must sit still for ever. Either, therefore, there can be no compacts and no covenants whatever, or they must be subject to certain qualifications, and accompanied with a dispensing power, placed somewhere or another. There is no middle course, because no multiplication of express limitations, no stretch of imagination to comprehend every possible contingency, not even the utmost simplicity and facility of the act promised, can put it wholly beyond the reach of some casual interference. A man may swear that the next minute he will raise his hand to his hat, but before that minute arrives his arm may be struck with palsy. Now as society cannot exist without promises and compacts, it also *necessarily* sanctions the essential conditions attached to them. Bishop Sanderson has enumerated them very clearly, and has distinctly asserted, what no man in his senses can doubt, that no formal expression of them is required to prove their necessary existence in the mind of the person who imposes the promise, nor therefore to prove their necessary

employment by the promiser to limit the extent of his promise, without any risk of perjury.

If the obstacle to the strict fulfilment be a physical law, the conscience is released by the performance of all within our power. If it be a moral or religious law, then to make the engagement is a sin, and we must suffer for it; but to fulfil it is a still greater sin, and is therefore prohibited. If it be a great practical inconvenience, by which one part of a promise interferes with another, the higher end must be preferred to the lower, the spirit to the letter. If it be human legislation, supposing the law to have existed previous to the promise, it ought not to have been resisted, and therefore the promise is void; but the conscience can only be cleared by fulfilling in some other shape so much of it as is lawful. But if the law be made subsequent to the promise, as in any law now passed by the parliament prohibiting obedience to collegiate statutes, then will come in the comparison between the duty of performing the promise, and the duty of obedience to the laws. And as all laws and all obedience derive their obligation from the laws of God, it will be necessary to direct our conduct by the simple principles of religion. If our conscience recognizes in the laws of the land the laws of God, it is justified in submitting to the proposed limitation or alteration in the promise. And thus the members of colleges consented to the abrogation of so much of their oaths as bound them to popish practices. But if not, then the duty is obvious to give up all the personal advantages which we obtained by the promise, and, as we can no longer fulfil it without disobedience, or depart from it without a sin, to place those persons to whom it was taken as nearly as possible in their original position, without becoming ourselves parties to any infraction of their wishes. It is obvious that on this principle any perversion of ecclesiastical institutions to any purposes but those of the church must be followed by the resignation or expulsion of all their conscientious members.

But in every one of these cases it is evident that the last decision, on the impracticability or inexpediency, rests with the conscience of the party who makes the promise. If this is not the final appeal, there can be no need of a promise, for a promise is only imposed as the last moral check, where all other checks must terminate. And it is also absolutely necessary, that in making its decision the conscience should be regulated by two principles: the first, to take a rule of interpretation, and a sanction for any relaxation of the strict letter of the compact, not from its own momentary feeling, but from some unbiased, external, and independent authority—from long precedent—from the conduct of others—from the opinions of sound and disinterested judges. The second principle is, to choose for the most part that interpretation which is accompanied with the greatest personal sacrifice. When these two rules have been observed, the conscience is wholly relieved.

It is surely needless to remark, that no doctrine can be more remote than this from the principles of Popery. There the dispensing power is vested, not in the conscience of the individuals, checked by, and harmonizing with, the decision of rightful interpreters of God's will, but in the judgment of the so called *church alone*, and that judgment but another word for its selfish and criminal interests. In the theory of oaths, as in every other question, we may trace the

respective principles of Popery, dissent, and of the true catholic Christianity of the English Church. Dissent gives absolute power to the unbridled fancy of the individual. Popery subjects it servilely and blindly to the will of another. Catholic Christianity calls on it to act, and to act manfully and energetically, but with constant and reverential deference to right authorities, and with distrust of its own imaginations.

Why the necessity of this dispensing power in the human conscience renders it equally necessary to convert a promise to man into a promise to and in the presence of God—in other words, into an oath—will appear by some subsequent observations.

XII. But having stated that neither promises nor oaths can be rightly enforced where the fulfilment of them is *impracticable*, it is necessary here also to guard against another dangerous ambiguity in this word. It means, first, what is impracticable even to a perfect man—one as nearly perfect, that is, as man may be; and, secondly, what is unfulfilled solely from our moral defects, from our not choosing to fulfil it. In the former sense, a promise or oath to do what is impracticable is an absurdity, and a mockery of God. In the latter sense, it is at times absolutely necessary: it is absolutely necessary to lay down general laws for moral agents, which we cannot hope they will wholly perform; absolutely necessary to surround them with the highest moral influences, which we know will very often fail of effect; and absolutely necessary, in certain conditions, to make men promise, and promise in the presence of God, to do that which is never likely to be done by any one with the infirmities of a man. This will sound paradoxical, but it is still true. The mere existence of Christianity is the best evidence of its truth. And the explanation lies here.

It very often happens that it is right and necessary to enforce, and enforce by a promise, obedience not only to one particular act, but to a variety of laws. Whenever a complicated trust is formed, particularly if it embraces a number of persons, and is to continue permanent for years, this must happen, and it must be permitted, otherwise no such trusts can be framed, and the most valuable institutions in the country will be lost. But a system of general laws, by their very nature, and from the nature of man, must be liable, even under the best intention, to occasional neglect and infraction. Exact obedience, therefore, is a moral impossibility, and no one can expect it. But yet it must be demanded, and demanded to specific laws; otherwise there is no security whatever for the fulfilment of the trust. What must we do? Not abolish the promise; not annihilate the trust, and with it all its uses; but contrive with the promise to connect provisions which, while they leave the law of obedience perfect, may secure relief to the conscience for accidental or necessary infractions.

In all such systems of laws provisions of this kind are found. No man wise enough to be a legislator could be ignorant enough to omit them. They are to be found on a very grand scale both in the Legal and the Christian law; and, in our own civil institutions, one of the most useful is the conversion of a promise into an oath. The problem, in fact, here is the same with the great problem of all moral education applied to frail and imperfect beings. It is to reconcile the greatest fear with the greatest safety—the strongest obligation

to obey with the least ultimate danger from obedience: and they are reconciled chiefly by making the promise a religious obligation, acting in the following manner:—

Remove the notion of imprecation, and what is the position of the party who takes the oath? He now stands not only before man but God; is made amenable to an additional tribunal, and subjected to far higher influences. The fear of violating the promise is far more strong, first, because the presence of God and his personal observation is more full of awe than that of man; secondly, because the terrors of his anger are unseen, and the punishment upon perjury indefinite; and, thirdly, because all the sensibilities of shame before the eyes of the world, and apprehension of evil from man, which give weight and validity to a common promise, are included in the oath; and man, to whom it is taken, acts afterward as the minister of God in avenging any insult upon his name.

And yet at the very same time the violation of a promise to God is far more safe, is far less likely utterly to destroy the moral constitution, offers far more chances of ultimate recovery, than a violation to man. This statement also may appear a paradox, but it is undoubtedly true; and it requires explanation to those who propose to substitute declarations for oaths, as far less injurious to the conscience. In the first place, it must be remembered that in each case the crime by itself is precisely the same, although it is not felt to be the same. A. steals in opposition to a promise, B. without any promise. The guilt of stealing is in each alike, and whether the promise is to man or God can make no difference. In each act of stealing the same laws of honesty are broken. In each also there is contempt for the honor of God, whether we disobey his commands without thinking of his presence, as in the case of a promise to man, or are carried away from them in opposition to former resolutions of obeying them, as in the case of an oath. Whether we never think of a person, or forget him for a time, matters little. Only that man is nearer to piety who has once been impressed with a sense of God's presence, and has formed intentions of honoring him, though intentions which, from the weakness of his nature, he may at times have failed to fulfil, than one who is kept in ignorance almost of God's existence; in ignorance, at least, that he superintends and witnesses all the dealings of men, and that no act is right or wrong except as it relates to him. Grievous lapses are indeed grievous things; but there may be a darkness and deadness which never lapses, because it never advances, and this is far more grievous. And such is the state to which mankind will be reduced when for occasional accidental trespasses against God's name and honor, we substitute the greatest and most deliberate dishonor to it, the putting it clean away out of all our dealings.

Moreover, in the case of a Christian, it must never be forgotten that every vice or fault of whatever kind, whether in contradiction or not to an express particular oath, is a contradiction of a previous oath—one made on the most solemn occasion, and renewed deliberately, and by many men often. We cannot sin without breaking our vow at baptism; and to break any subsequent vow or promise can add little to the heinousness of such an original offence. It is not because men do not feel the obligation of their oath at baptism, renewed as it is in every profession of

their Christian faith, and do feel the obligation of an oath made on some particular occasion, perhaps with more external solemnity, that the intrinsic obligation of one is less than the obligation of the other. Our sensibility to moral obligation, as was stated before, is the very last standard to which we should refer for the real measure of duty—for the real measure of remorse when the conscience becomes awakened—for the real measure of punishment, whether it is awakened or not. And if now, as in better days, men when they sinned in any way were reminded that each sin was a lie—were told of their solemn promise to obey all the commands of God—if that promise were renewed by them as solemnly as it was made in primitive times, when those who were about to be initiated stood up in the presence of the church, and with loud voice and outstretched hands swore themselves servants of their Maker—if the oaths which they then swore were treasured up to be brought out against them, as witnesses of every failing; and their vows were brought daily before them as recorded faithfully and strictly in the sight of Heaven, to last there until the day of trial—if, in one word, the church herself, as in her better days, had rigidly maintained the whole mystery of baptism, we should not now be called on to defend the practice of swearing to God in cases of human dealings which may be brought under the example and the sanction of his own most holy institution. And we should not have been led into the error of dreading a violation of a subsequent oath as a crime beyond all pardon, while the violation of our oath at baptism is passed over without notice, and without fear, as if it were no oath at all.

Still it is said there are such things as weak consciences, and they are not to be rashly offended. There are such things as raw consciences, and in the present day the affectation of them is very common—consciences morbidly and tremulously sensitive to some slight demand upon their trust in God's mercy, which yet are as firm as a rock upon the commission of heavy sins. Like the somnambulist, they sit still under a blow upon the back without knowing that it was given, but when a finger touches the hair of their head, they shriek out in agony. This is the moral sensibility which in the present day is indulged and encouraged. No man is so wholly cased in armour but that he has some little point through which shame may reach him. And this point he calls his conscience; and as each man has his own point, and probably a different one, and as nothing is to be enforced which is to wound the conscience of any one, nothing can be enforced at all. Would it not be better to remind men that while they are committing great sins without shame, the fear of committing a less must at least be regarded with suspicion; that conscience is not a casual feeling on a particular act, but the whole faculty of man's reason brought seriously and comprehensively and solemnly to bear upon the whole range of his duties; that it cannot be trusted without infinite peril until it has been purified by practical habits, enlarged by patient thought, tested by self-denial, sanctified by prayer; that when the plea of conscience comes in, as we see it brought in every day, to shake off some check upon our heart, to escape from some discipline, to avoid the payment of a church rate, or to rob the revenues of God in order to appropriate them to man,—some little doubt may reasonably be felt, if this acute

and delicate intuition of right and wrong be not rather hypocrisy than truth, prudery than innocence.

Nothing, indeed, should be done in things indifferent to wound even the most childish conscience. But where practices are right in themselves, to abolish them, because they shock the casual feelings of ignorant men, is to establish a principle which must end in subverting all rule, all education, and all society.

Lastly, if the repugnance to an oath arises not from a moral sensibility to guilt, but from a fear of the punishment on violation—and this is the danger to be dreaded—let men ask themselves seriously whether they would rather fall as criminals into the hands of man or of God? We are only about to expand the brief declaration of Ambrose, "He who owes a debt to man must pay the whole; but he who is a debtor to God, when all else fails, may pay with penitence and tears."

Of all stern, hard-hearted, unforgiving tyrannies, that of human opinion over man, when unmitigated by any thought of religion, is the worst. It is rendered inexorable not only by the bad passions of human nature, but by its own weakness. It cannot afford to pardon. And hence the law of honor, especially when man's interest or resentment is concerned in it, is absolutely cruel. Very different from the mercy of God, it makes no allowance for the frailty of human nature, admits no satisfaction, enforces the penalty to the utmost, cuts off for one single offence all hopes of reformation and amendment. And if in the engagements of life a law of honor is to be substituted for the law of God, and for every violation of a promise man is made amenable to man without any reference to his Maker, his case will indeed be hopeless.

* * * * *

If the principles are correct, the application of them will be easy; but without reference to principles, any alteration in our system of oaths must be most hazardous and unwise. All that we are pleading for is caution, humility, deep thought, and self-distrust in disturbing our ancient landmarks. It is true, indeed, that oaths have been multiplied of late to a very alarming extent, that they have been admitted where they should never have been tolerated, administered irreverently, trifled with publicly and wantonly, and perhaps even by the best of men not observed with that solemn feeling which they are intended to inspire. And therefore, says the spirit of the age, let them be swept away root and branch. They have been abused, and now we will destroy them. May we not ask if the very abuse and multiplication do not prove the truth of some good principle from which they sprang, and which still may be found in a portion of them? Can we indulge in safety this wild, promiscuous demolition, without attempting to fix very deeply and very clearly the limits of the good and the evil? And ought we not to look, as the first means of correction, to the seat of all abuses, the human heart, and give fresh sanctity and power to oaths, by inspiring reverence, and truth, and piety into those who administer or accept them?

It is true, also, that the early church, though its practice, like the authority of Scripture, in many remarkable instances sanctioned the enforcement of some oaths, spoke against them in general with the most unmeasured severity. Scarcely one of Chrysostom's ear-

lier homilies occur without strong and repeated denunciations against them; but those oaths were such as fell under the exceptions established above. They were voluntary, wanton, administered without authority and for private purposes, without regard to the temptation to violate them, assertory, imprecatory, and such as tempted God by unwarranted appeals to his supernatural vengeance. The real principle of an oath the early Christian church enforced in every way. "Let a man swear by his life," "let the name of God be upon every action," were her favorite mottoes. And if she refused the formal declaration of the principle, it was only because the necessity of any declaration seemed to impugn and throw doubt upon the sincerity of her inward feeling. Afterward, when this high tone of Christian piety was lowered, and it became necessary to avow and enforce religious sanctions publicly, because in secret they were so often neglected, the church, from the time of Constantine, began to multiply oaths indefinitely, and to apply them to all the duties of life in which religion could be naturally infused. Particularly all the relations of society which depended on mutual faith, such as allegiance to a sovereign, fealty to a lord, service to a master, were all sanctified by oath. And in our own country, from peculiar circumstances, the system of purgation was admitted to an extent which shocks and astonishes the conceited ignorance of the present day. We forget that we are living under a totally different system. We make no allowance for the necessities of a half-formed state of society, and we neither study nor understand the many admirable contrivances by which, under the administration of the church, even the superstition of the ordeal was rendered no despicable instrument for detecting crime, deterring perjury, and sheltering the innocent.

Upon this followed an age in which, with the corruption of the Romish Church, all other truths and systems became corrupted likewise. Then oaths were made instruments of worldly policy, and abused to the lowest purposes. And now they are all to be cast off, because piety is so lost, and men's hearts are so hardened, that the name of God no longer acts as a warning or a terror. For this is the true cause—not that we reverence God more than former ages, but that we reverence him less. And that has come to pass in our own days which Plato (*De Leg.*, lib. xii) lamented even in his days, and against which, in his usual deep, penetrating, masculine wisdom, he made the same provisions which we have endeavored to point out at present, and which cannot be stated, in conclusion, better than in his own words:—

"There was," says he, "a legislator of old, who laid down a law for his tribunals which we may well admire. He saw that men around him believed in God; for there were children of God still upon earth, and he himself was one. To God, therefore, and not to man, he intrusted the decisions of justice, by imposing upon each litigant an oath. But now when of the men around us some believe that no God exists; some that he cares not for mortals; some, the most common and most wicked, that by offerings and flatteries he may be bribed to become their accomplice in villainy; now, in an age like this, the rule of that great legislator would indeed be folly. Man's piety has changed, and our laws must be changed also; and therefore in all our courts prohibit the oath of both parties. Let

the plaintiff record his charge, not swear to it; let the defendant enter his reply, but deliver it unsworn. For," he adds, "it would indeed be awful for trial upon trial to occur within our walls, and for us to know and feel that nearly half the parties to them were perjured souls; and yet to mix with them, meet them at table, talk with them, intermarry with them! Let," he concludes, "an oath be taken from judges, from magistrates, from electors to high offices, from all in whom is reposed any weighty trust, and who have no interest in perjury. But whenever perjury would lead to gain, decide the cause without an oath. Let no one swear to enhance his credit; let there be no imprecation."

From the American Quarterly Register.

ART. V.—ON THE MODESTY BECOMING A CHRISTIAN MINISTER.

BY REV. DANIEL DANA, D.D.

NOTHING is so essential to the prosperity of religion as the character of its ministers. Their office and work require high and peculiar qualifications. In this point all are substantially agreed.

In the character of an *untaught teacher* the most ignorant perceive an incongruity. The veriest of hypocrites demands in a minister unimpeached sincerity; and the most profligate of men, a spotless example.

So pervading and general a sentiment carries with it decisive evidence of truth. It is drawn from the inmost depths of the human mind. It may be impaired; but it cannot be effaced. Even in the present low state of religion and morals in the community it retains much of its original strength.

Many things, indeed, in the existing condition of our country are adapted to improve the ministerial character, by eliciting and strengthening some of its best attributes.

While most other sciences are making rapid advances, it would be unnatural that religion, the best of all sciences, should stand still.

The rapid extension of the gospel, with the imperious demand for its still farther extension, is fitted to rouse the energies of every minister, to quicken the impulses of his heart, and nerve the vigor of his arm.

In the meantime an endless variety of domestic objects and interests prefer their claims. While societies, anniversaries, public assemblies, resolutions, and speeches are indefinitely multiplied, no minister can well be idle. His thoughts and feelings, and, if he has them, his talents and eloquence, will have an ample field for their exhibition.

But amid these demands for energy, and temptations to display, there is latent danger. Especially there is danger lest virtues of the more passive or secluded cast be neglected and forgotten. There is one virtue, I mean that of *modesty*, which is already cast into the shade; and is, indeed, in some danger of being transferred from the list of virtues to that of weaknesses.

It is my wish to speak a word for this lovely stranger; to lead her out from her seclusion, to vindicate her rights, and to assign her due importance and praise.

I remark, then, in the first place, genuine modesty does not imply, strictly speaking, an undervaluing of one's own character and attainments. This is true in an absolute and a comparative sense. It is admitted that the apostle, in addressing Christians, enjoins them, in *lowliness of mind each to esteem others better than themselves*. But these expressions cannot bear a literal construction. Thus understood, they would inculcate on Christians the sweeping conclusion, that all around them were better men and better Christians than themselves; which, of course, would be false. Still the apostle's meaning is very plain; and he puts the guard in the right place. Knowing the pride of the human heart, and the proneness even of the partially sanctified to judge too unfavorably of others, and too favorably of themselves, he would have them reverse the proceeding. He would have them transfer to themselves that severity which they are prone to exercise toward others; and to others, that unbounded candor which they are apt to indulge toward themselves. Just as, in the case of a staff, or wand, which has been much bent a particular way, we correct the obliquity, not simply by giving it a straight position, but by bending it the opposite way. Thus viewed, the apostle's direction will coincide with the idea of the ancient philosopher, who represented mankind as passing through the world with each a bag or wallet on his shoulder, in the fore part of which he placed the faults of his neighbors, and in the hinder part his own. "The business of philosophy," he adds, "is to turn the wallet." The business of Christianity is substantially the same. And what a delightful revolution would be witnessed in neighborhoods, in churches and communities, if all Christians, and all ministers, adopted these lovely principles of judgment.

If modesty does not consist in forming too low an opinion of our own characters and attainments, still less is it found in the habit of verbally disparaging ourselves. Some persons never speak of themselves but in the most debasing terms. This, however, is a very equivocal proof of modesty. Rather, it is an artful, but ill-concealed attempt at self-exaltation. Believe the declarations of these very modest persons, and you bitterly disappoint them. Adopt their opinions, and you incur their resentment and hatred.

Nor is true modesty inconsistent with *decision* in opinions, or in character. The modest man, indeed, forms his opinions on great and interesting subjects with caution; for he investigates coolly; he sees difficulties, and feels the force of objections. But this caution is the parent of confidence—a just confidence, which, as it is not easily acquired, is not easily resigned. It is the superficial thinker who never patiently examines, never doubts, and never hesitates. And as his opinions are formed in the dark, it is not unnatural that they should take flight at the first approach of daylight. A volume might be written on the emptiness and superficiality of these arrogant pretenders, in contrast with the modesty of real science.

And why should it be thought that modesty is incompatible with decision of character? Does it obliterate from the mind a sense of moral obligation—of the immutable distinction between right and wrong? Does it destroy the fear of God, and reverence for his laws? Does it efface the impression of his all-surrounding presence and all-seeing eye? These are the elements which go to constitute

genuine decision of character. And they all find a natural and welcome abode in the subdued and self-diffident mind.

Indeed it is the modest man alone who duly appreciates the difficulties as well as the motives of virtue; its obstacles, not less than its rewards. Of course, he alone is prepared to pursue a uniform and inflexible line of rectitude. Let the world, then, correct its estimate of things. Let it transfer to this unassuming class that praise of decision and energy which it has been too apt to bestow on the bold, the self-confident, and the reckless.

Nor is there any thing in genuine modesty which relents from the loftiest enterprises, or the most vigorous efforts. The motto adopted by one of the most unassuming as well as energetic men of the age just passed, was, *Expect great things; attempt great things.* Animated by this simple but noble maxim, he pursued, through a long life, a course of action which has poured unnumbered blessings on the millions of India, and endeared his name to every friend of religion and humanity.

An example of consummate modesty, combined with the boldest enterprise and courage, has been furnished by our own country, in the case of her most illustrious son. The unaffected reluctance and self-diffidence with which Washington accepted the two highest offices in her gift could be surpassed only by the commanding power and success with which their diversified duties were executed. And to this moment the problem remains unsolved, whether as a hero or a magistrate he exhibited superior excellence.

But we ascend higher still. The great apostle of the Gentiles was as humble and modest as he was great. No man more perfectly familiarized the declaration of Jesus to his disciples: *Without me ye can do nothing.* Still we hear him declaring, with more than human courage, *I can do all things through Christ strengthening me.* And where is the page of history which records exploits or sacrifices in the cause of Christ, which can bear a comparison with his?

It appears, then, that modesty is not that tame, spiritless, inefficient thing which many seem to imagine it. It is allied to the best and noblest qualities of the human mind and heart. It is a prominent and lovely attribute of some of the most estimable characters which have ever shone forth in our world. A vast proportion of the acknowledged ornaments and benefactors of their species have been genuinely modest men. A vast proportion of the solid good which has been effected for the interests of human society has been effected by the unassuming and unpretending part of mankind. We need not except the achievements of science and philosophy. Sciolists and semi-philosophers, it is confessed, have usually been vain, self-sufficient, and arrogant. But genuine and thorough-going philosophers, men of finished minds and finished learning, have been self-diffident and modest. Those who have conversed most intimately with the works of God, and the mysteries of nature, have found little time or inclination to admire themselves or their works. Those who have pierced the earth and scaled the stars, who have launched forth on voyages of discovery into the infinite regions of space, have returned but to confess the imperfection of their powers and their acquisitions. Of this we have a fine specimen in the case of the prince of philosophers. While Newton resided at the university, Roger Cotes was there, and a fellow of the same college

with himself. He was of kindred genius and pursuits, and died at the age of thirty-four. Newton, some time after his death, exclaimed, with his own touching simplicity, "If he had lived, we should have *known something*." What views this wonderful man had of his own powers and attainments may be gathered from another remark which he made toward the close of his life. "I do not know," said he, "what I may appear to the world; but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the seashore, and diverting myself in, now and then, finding a smoother pebble, or a prettier shell, than ordinary; while the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me."

When speaking of that modesty which becomes the Christian, and especially the Christian minister, we are arrested by a thought which, if true, is deeply interesting. Modesty is not a mere appendage or ornament of religion, but enters into its very constitution and essence. If, in the Christian professor, modesty is absent, religion itself is absent. If, in this point, there is a flagrant defect, doubt and suspicion are thrown over his whole character. The importance of this thought gives it a claim to a careful development.

All religion has its foundation laid in humility. Humility, too, pervades the superstructure. The representation of the ancient father was scarcely too strong when he said, in reply to the question, What is the first thing in religion? Humility. What is the second? Humility. What is the third? Humility. The real Christian, by the light of God's spiritual and searching law, has found his own depravity—his deep and utter depravity, his guilt, his ruin, his helplessness, his exposure to the endless wrath of a just God. He has felt a repentance which breaks the heart with unutterable grief for sin, and inspires it with habitual self-abasement. If he has hope of pardon, that hope centres in atoning blood. Nor does he feel himself less indebted to the power of the Holy Spirit for a new heart and for every right disposition. These thoughts are familiar. They are engraved in his inmost heart. Let such a man be proud if he can. But it is impossible. He is laid under necessity—precious, absolute necessity, to be humble. And if humble, then modest. For what is modesty but humility looking out at the eyes, beaming in the countenance, and spreading itself over the whole deportment?

Farther: real religion is progressive, and progress in religion is progress in humility. The Christian does not live, but Christ lives in him. All his attainments in holiness he owes, not to his own self-originated resolutions and independent efforts, but to the power and grace of his Master. If these are not facts, the gospel is a set of enigmas, and the Bible the most unintelligible of books. But the Christian feels these things to be facts. And this feeling is adapted to destroy every root and fibre of pride and self-complacency. If he differs from the vilest of mankind, he ascribes it to sovereign grace. If he makes any advance on his own attainments, he is but the more indebted to the same sovereign grace. Who sees not, then, that every advance of holiness will be an increase of humility and self-abasement?

We may take another view of things. Progress in religion is progress in pious sensibility, in delicacy of spiritual perception, taste, and feeling. The advanced Christian takes expanded and elevated views of the beauty and perfection of God, and of the mysteries of

his Saviour's love. These views impart a quickened sense of his own personal and infinite obligation; and thus he cannot compare what he has rendered to his God and Saviour with what he was bound to render, but with tenderness and grief. His warmest love appears cold; his tenderest gratitude, a kind of guilty ingratitude. His most ardent devotion seems too languid, and his best obedience scarcely worthy of the name. The mind which is occupied by such views as these can find no room for pride, or vanity, or ambition. It can be the abode of no feelings but those of the most subdued and humble character.

The Christian minister must hold habitual and intimate converse with the Bible. And of all books in the world the Bible maintains the most determined, uncompromising hostility with human pride. All its doctrines and precepts, all its warnings, promises, and threatenings are designed to subdue and eradicate this worst and most pernicious of all the vices of the mind. Especially do those mysteries of revelation which baffle our reason, and elude our comprehension, tend to promote modesty of intellect, as well as humility of heart. And there is no man who will fairly put his mind and heart to these sublime mysteries, without finding their auspicious practical influence. They will effectually subdue vanity and pride. They will inspire that humility which is the parent and nurse of every lovely virtue.

The true minister is eminently a man of prayer. And what is prayer but the immediate approach of a frail, impure, erring child of dust, to the high and holy One? Must not such an approach be almost necessarily attended with an entire prostration of spirit? In company with a fellow-mortal, a man may too easily find materials for pride, arrogance, and self-sufficiency. But can a man be proud, arrogant, and self-sufficient in the presence of spotless purity and infinite majesty? And must not such an intercourse leave behind it an impress on the mind, the countenance, and whole demeanor? Can the man or the minister who is habitually vain, self-conceited, self-satisfied, be a man of prayer? We cannot follow him to his retirement. His closet may reveal no secrets. But does not such a demeanor reveal secrets of the most affecting and appalling kind?

In a word, the true minister of Jesus resembles his Master. If it be true, that without the spirit of Christ no man can be a Christian, it is emphatically true, that without the spirit of Christ no man can be a Christian minister. *Learn of me*, says the Saviour, *for I am meek and lowly*. Humility, then, is the first lesson that he teaches. Until this lesson is learned, nothing is learned. A prayerless and profane minister is a solecism indeed. And why not a vain and proud minister too?

We have now had opportunity to perceive that modesty, though confessedly a bright ornament of the Christian character, is not a *mere* ornament, but rather a constituent part of that character. In other words, we have seen that without it a man can scarcely be a real Christian, and much less a consistent and exemplary one. In our discussion we have had in immediate view the minister of the gospel. In our farther remarks on the subject, we shall have a still more particular reference to this order of men.

Let us then glance at some considerations which evince the value and importance of modesty to the Christian minister.

It cannot but exercise a salutary influence on his investigation of truth and the formation of his religious opinions. Not, as we have seen, that it will impart an indecisive air to his speculations. Not that it will repress the spirit of the freest inquiry. Not that it will preclude the mind from any accessible source of information, or any legitimate instrument of knowledge. But the modest man, in all his inquiries, will bear in mind the imperfection of his faculties and the necessarily limited sphere of their operation. He remembers that error is often found on the surface, while truth must be sought many degrees below it; that error is artful, insinuating, obtrusive; while truth is simple, modest, and retiring. Above all, he remembers that the author of truth has established certain boundaries which mortals may not pass; which to transcend is fraught with numberless evils. These are maxims which are obvious to common sense, but which philosophers and divines have often overlooked. If modern France has proved that the principles of civil and political liberty, when pushed to excess and extravagance, issue in folly, madness, and ruin, modern Germany has proved that the principles of philosophical investigation may be so perverted and overdone as to originate the most monstrous errors and absurdities. Many of its metaphysicians and theologists, taking leave of sober reason, and bursting away *extra flammantia mænia mundi*, have found themselves in regions of darkness never before explored. A little common sense and common modesty would have saved themselves the disgrace, and the world the annoyance, of these deplorable exhibitions. Still the actual influence of these wandering stars on the interests of religion and literature has been unspeakably disastrous. So much parade of learning, and affectation of philosophy, combined with so much cold-blooded, heartless infidelity, could not fail to produce wide-spread and destructive effects. The human mind has been unhinged; the most settled principles of belief have been undermined, and the wildest of vagaries have assumed the solemn garb of reason and philosophy. Our own country has sustained a shock in its most vital interests, and especially in its religion. There was a time when the infidelity of Germany, under the name of an improved theology, threatened to deluge our land like a flood. And even now, when the evil is somewhat checked at its source, its transmitted and deleterious influence is far from being unfelt in our country. A bold and reckless spirit of speculation, a contempt for long-established opinions, and a preference of *new error* to *old truth*, are still but too prevalent. While these temptations beset our young ministers and students, and while many are actually ensnared, there are others, it may be confidently believed, who have taken a salutary alarm. Looking through the emptiness of false philosophy, and perceiving the wretched impotence of reason as a religious guide when unaided by light from heaven, they feel the absolute necessity of implicitly submitting the understanding to heavenly illumination, and of seeking religious truth at its divine source. It is in the exercise of this meek and modest spirit alone that religious truth is found, and here is the only security from the wildest and most pernicious errors. So far as this spirit prevails, ministers become safe and instructive guides to their fellow-men. So far as it prevails, the church is *the pillar and ground of the truth*; the light of a darkened and erring world.

As modesty is thus needful to the minister in forming his religious opinions, it gives a grace to his manner of imparting them. It is admitted that the grand and fundamental truths of religion are perspicuous in themselves, and plain in their evidence. If, on these topics, it is the duty of every Christian to think and speak with decision, it is still more clearly the duty of every minister. But confidence is not arrogance, nor is decision dogmatism. There is a harsh, magisterial air in the pulpit, which makes truth seem repulsive; and from the lips of some preachers grace itself appears ungracious. It is a calm, unobtrusive manner which most unequivocally betokens conviction in the speaker; and it is this manner which is most adapted to beget conviction in the hearer. There is an unaffected, honest deference which a judicious minister knows how to pay to the understanding of his hearers, and this deference is generally paid back with interest. Prejudices and objections often fly before it, which would have stood their ground against severity and dogmatism. All the distinguishing doctrines of the gospel are naturally unwelcome to the human heart. But it is not therefore the less undesirable that by a harsh, overbearing manner in the delivery, they should be rendered still more repulsive. And if, on the other hand, there are truths, as doubtless there are, which are adapted to soften and to break the most obdurate heart, how important is it that the mildness and tenderness of their exhibition be such as should give them the fullest, deepest impression.

So long as human hearts retain their depravity, and Christians their imperfections, so long will differences and contrarieties of opinions find their way into the church. These discrepancies of opinion will give birth to religious controversy. And how humbling is the thought, that religious controversy is often conducted with greater acrimony than is generally witnessed in the contests of worldly men. And how much more deplorable is it, that the acrimony should frequently be not in direct, but *inverse* proportion to the importance of the subject debated. Yet such has been too often the case. If in regard to the government of the church, the divine author of the Bible has given to his followers a degree of latitude, which is probably the case, then it follows that all bitter disputes as to the form of church government are at once needless, fruitless, and wicked. Yet it is by disputes upon these, and other unessential topics, that the church has in every age been agitated, convulsed, and torn asunder. These things are the opprobrium of religion, the grief of the pious, and the triumph of the ungodly. When shall such evils be banished? When shall these fires of hell be extinguished? When shall the church witness again that golden era when Christians *loved each other with pure hearts fervently*; when the whole *multitude of those who believed* were of one heart and of one mind? We answer, When Christians shall imbibe more of the spirit of their meek and lowly Master; when they shall honestly resolve to treat great things as great things, and little things as little things; when, conscious of their own infirmities and errors, they shall treat kindly the infirmities and errors of their brethren; when they shall be modest in their claims and generous in their concessions. When these revolutions shall take place, the church will arise from her depressions, will cast off her incumbrances, will look forth in beauty and glory, the joy of earth, and the bright resemblance of heaven.

The modesty we are recommending is an important safeguard against a *worldly* spirit. Than such a spirit nothing is more inveterately hostile to the power and prosperity of religion. To the Christian minister it is peculiarly noxious. It cripples his energies and impairs his usefulness. It even corrodes the vitals of his piety. In every age it has *cast down many wounded*. In every nation its progress has been marked with spiritual desolation and death in the church and in its ministry. In our own age and country, the dangers from this source are singularly multiplied and alarming. With a fertile soil, a free government, and a rapid advance in the arts and luxuries of living, we have had for years an exuberant tide of wealth and prosperity flowing in upon us. The world has seemed to array itself in new charms, and life to exhibit new attractions. Pleasure, self-gratification, in all their varied forms, have become the universal rage. The church has not escaped the contagion. Never, perhaps, in any period or country, was the church pervaded by such a spirit of gain, of luxury and splendor, as in our own at the present time. In this state of the church the condition of the minister is dangerous and trying in the extreme. What shall prevent his being swept away by the torrent of fashion? What shall save him from plunging into that vortex of worldliness and dissipation, where dignity of character is lost, and ministerial influence is lost, and not unfrequently shipwreck is made of an immortal hope? But these are not the only dangers. He may be precluded by narrowness of circumstances from running a race with the votaries of wealth and splendor. He may find himself the object of neglect, of pity, or scorn, with those who claim to prescribe the laws of fashion and the tone of public sentiment. And what shall sustain him in circumstances like these? We answer, In both the cases supposed the minister has one resort, one refuge. He may find it in a subdued, humble, unaspiring mind; and he can find it nowhere else. If he has sat at the feet of a lowly Saviour, he has found where real happiness springs. If he has risen to communion with God, he can look down on all which the world thinks elevated and great. If he is enriched with the treasures of the gospel, and may communicate these treasures to others, he is rich to his heart's content. If he has the humble hope of his Saviour's smile, he may well be deaf to the world's applause, and repay its neglect or scorn with compassion.

If the spirit of worldliness is disastrous in its influence on the ministerial character, the spirit of ambition is not the less so. Many, indeed, who have been inaccessible to the attractions of wealth and splendor, have been corrupted and destroyed by the love of praise. This passion is as powerful as it is pernicious. Wherever it gains access it takes possession of the whole soul. It claims to reign supreme, and without a rival. The Deity himself is dethroned. The wretched devotee, withdrawing his worship from his Maker, becomes the worshipper of himself. Nor is he content till the whole church and the whole world unite in the same idolatry, and bow at the same altar. If the question be asked, What is the source of those numberless errors and heresies which have vexed and distracted the Christian church from age to age? it must be replied, that the grand source of the evil is ambition. Men possessed of some learning, but of still more restlessness and love of distinction,

have perverted the Scriptures. Not content to let them speak their own language, they have invented a language for them. Some novel but false idea has darted into their own minds, and they have found it in the Scriptures, or forced it upon them. The deviation from truth may at first be small; but as the importance of the new idea becomes identified with their own importance, it soon becomes a great and momentous affair. Every thing in the Bible which remotely countenances the favorite is sedulously pressed into the service, and every thing of a contrary aspect as sedulously overlooked. Gradually a new *theory* arises, which, itself immortal, is to give immortality to its author. But the cause of truth and piety receives a wound; and error and division are perpetuated in the church.

Such has been the origin of error in the past ages of the church. In *every* age of the church there is danger that men occupying eminent stations, men ambitious of literary distinction, and not distrustful of their own powers, should substitute the *form* or *semblance* of Christianity in the place of its vital essence. And this the more as it is well known that a *plausible counterfeit* of the doctrines of the gospel is, to the generality of human hearts, more welcome than those doctrines themselves. Ministers of every description, especially those of the younger class, are exposed to the same snare. It is gratifying to personal vanity, and of this the best have enough, to be uttering one's own novel and showy fancies rather than those plain, old-fashioned doctrines of the Bible which have nothing to recommend them but their everlasting truth and infinite importance.

But there are other modes in which ambition is displayed and gratified. Let us cast a momentary glance across the Atlantic. Let us contemplate the great British anniversaries and the manner in which they are conducted. These occasions bring together a considerable portion, not only of the piety and benevolence, but of the taste and fashion, the distinguished nobility, with the dignified and respectable clergy of the metropolis and the nation. Not a few of the speeches are uttered by ministers of the gospel. These speeches are often prepared with much care; they are highly ornamented—surcharged, indeed, with flowers of rhetoric and flights of imagination. The speakers frequently compliment each other in no very measured terms. Their speeches are generally received by the audience with emphatic expressions of approbation. Those which are peculiarly brilliant call forth loud and reiterated bursts of applause. Here, then, certain serious questions arise. Will these exhibitors return entirely unharmed? Will their Christian character and feelings sustain no shock? If they brought to the scene some portion of spirituality and humility, will they carry as much away? Or will they be too apt to leave the greater part behind? In this pleasant collision of effort, on the one part, and admiration on the other, will no flame be enkindled, consuming the best sensibilities of the Christian, and even the finest feelings of natural delicacy? In this species of commerce, while a corrupting, deteriorating influence is imparted to the individual, will not a portion of the same bad influence return back upon the community?

The religious anniversaries of our own country are conducted in a more correct and chastened style. If on this point our British brethren view us as lagging behind the spirit of the age, we may

well cherish the wish, that the period may be distant when we shall overtake it. Yet with us serious and menacing evils exist. The species of eloquence which these occasions are found to cherish is not always in keeping either with the principles of good taste, or the genuine spirit of Christianity. Some speeches, indeed, delight us by their fulness of thought and force of reasoning; by their genuine pathos and unaffected piety. In others we perceive such a spirit of levity and display, with perhaps such abortive attempts at the sublime or pathetic as are truly disgusting. It cannot be denied that these occasions subject the modesty and humility of our clergy, the younger part especially, to a severe test. Those not unfrequently whose qualifications and claims are most decisive have an insuperable reluctance to these public appearances. While those with whom they are objects of ambition rarely come forward either with advantage to the public, or with honor and safety to themselves. Cases have occurred in which the unlimited indulgence of this ambition has proved the wreck of moral feeling and the sacrifice of Christian character.

A young minister comes forward under the most promising auspices. Apparently he is devoted, humble, unobtrusive, and lovely. His talents excite public notice. Societies of various descriptions take measures to enlist him in their cause. His first great public effort is approved; the second, admired; the third, warmly applauded. Soon his character as a popular public speaker is established. His name is extensively known, and his praise is sounded by a multitude of tongues. But, in the meantime, where is that simplicity, once so lovely! Where is that modesty, so attractive, and where that spirituality, so delightful? Alas! they are gone; they are utterly vanished. His countenance, his air, his whole demeanor, proclaim him vain, self-sufficient, arrogant; almost *a man of the world*. Who that knew him once is not ready to exclaim,

“If thou art he! but O how fallen!”

And who that has observed the progress of human character and human events is not prepared to witness a fall still more signal and tremendous—still more decisive of character and fate?

It might be difficult, perhaps impossible, to carry forward the great religious objects of the day without the aid of those public assemblages to which we have referred. They may be necessary instruments of awakening and keeping alive the general attention and interest. Nor do those evils to which they have sometimes given birth hold any natural or necessary connection with them. In themselves they would seem calculated to expand the heart, to purify and elevate the affections, to spread a healthful influence over the public mind, and to excite the energies of Christians to their noblest possible exercise. It is only by a perversion that they become scenes of mere curiosity, of amusement, of display; occasions of giving and receiving the incense of adulation. And surely it is a signal and lamentable perversion when, in this way, they become instruments to secularize religion, to pollute the sentiments and taste of the people, and to deteriorate the character of ministers.

But it is not in these public scenes alone that ministers are exposed and ensnared. Perils throng around their daily path. Even when engaged in their duties, which should make and keep them

humble, they are in danger of *losing* their humility. Even that kindness and partiality of an affectionate people designed by Heaven to stimulate and lighten their labors, too often furnish fuel to their pride and vanity.

The dangers of which we are speaking are not excluded even from the pulpit. This is a sacred inclosure; and of all possible intruders pride would appear to be the most unseemly and odious. Yet from this master-sin, entwining itself about every fibre of the human heart, the holiest and humblest of men are not wholly delivered. The angels of light, in their purity, and their worship, cover their faces, and sink in dust. While man, stained with guilt, and odious in his pollution, dreams of personal excellence; forgets himself and his Maker; is unabashed and irreverent in the presence of infinite Majesty. What do angels think? What do they think of our worship, of our sermons and prayers, of our praises and confessions? What do they think of what we style our reverence and devotion, our humility and love? And what does He think who charges the angels themselves with comparative impurity and folly.

Would not the Sabbath acquire a new sacredness, and the sanctuary an unspeakably increased interest, did every minister bring to the pulpit a deeply impressed sense of a present Deity? It would be the death blow of vanity and irreverence. The spirit of levity and the spirit of display would vanish before it. His looks, his tones, his air, his *every thing* would indicate the ambassador of Heaven. The sanctuary would assume the solemnity and silence of the tomb. Many would be ready to exclaim, *How dreadful is this place!* Few would retire unimpressed or unprofited.

The minister who is serious and humble in the sacred desk will naturally be chastened and modest in his deportment elsewhere. This is of high importance to the impression he will be apt to make on the general mind, both as it regards his personal character, and the religion he inculcates. Many respectable men are not discriminating in their views of religious doctrines. But most men are quick-sighted enough in detecting moral distinctions in the characters of religious guides. A meek and modest minister is generally known and noted, to the honor of religion. And so is a proud and arrogant minister, to its disgrace.

These remarks, on a topic of no small interest, are confessedly desultory. The writer has not aimed either to treat the subject very methodically, or to exhaust it. It is still fruitful of very important reflections. The hints he has thrown out he submits with great deference to the ministers of the gospel. He particularly asks for them the attention and candor of those numerous young men in a course of training for the Christian ministry, who, in forming their own character, are preparing to form the character and shape the destiny of those numberless immortal minds with which they will be hereafter surrounded.

For the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review.

ART. VI.—AN ADDRESS

*Before the Cuvierian Society of the Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.,
July 31, 1838.*

BY WILLIAM H. ALLEN, A. M.,

Professor of Chemistry and Experimental Philosophy, in Dickinson College.

Gentlemen of the Cuvierian Society,—In rising to address you and the audience favoring with their presence, I am conscious before whom I am to speak. I am to address many whose knowledge of that department of philosophy which this society is designed to promote, is far more extensive than my own; and who are infinitely more able than myself to do justice to the occasion. I need not inform you, therefore, that I stand here with no ordinary feelings of diffidence. I am consoled and encouraged, however, by the assurance that they who have advanced most deeply into the penetralia of nature, and who have been admitted most intimately to her sacred mysteries, will be most ready to extend indulgence to a votary yet in his novitiate, and most willing to excuse a tottering step in him who has but just trod upon the threshold of her temple.

It would be presumption in the pupil to arrogate the functions of the instructor. Equally presumptuous would it be in him who is now to address you to attempt the solution of some problem in natural science which has baffled the sagacity of the wisest men, merely to show how great a theme he dared to touch; or to broach some undigested theory to excite, perchance, the notice of an hour, and then to be buried with the thousands that have gone before, serving only to demonstrate the ingenious absurdity of their projectors. It were, indeed, a pleasing labor to sketch the history and progress of natural science from its early and feeble beginnings to its present colossal development. But there I perceive the footsteps of the veteran who stood in this place before me, and who spread out to your view the choicest flowers which adorned his pathway.* It better becomes me, just entering the great garden of nature, to confine myself to an humbler sphere. My object, therefore, in the present discourse, will be to present some of the motives to exertion which are placed before the philosopher of nature, and to show the spirit requisite to success in his pursuits.

All philosophy is founded on the study of relations. The relations which exist between man and his Maker, and the duties growing out of these relations, are the subjects of theological philosophy. The relations which exist between man and man, and the duties growing out of them, are the subjects of moral philosophy. The relations which exist between man and the material world, and between all material things, are the subjects of physical philosophy. In naming these great departments of knowledge it is not my intention to graduate them on a scale of value. The importance of each and all of them is known and admitted. Theology possesses claims on human attention strong as the hopes of immortality, solemn as the sanctions of eternity, fearful as the retributions of Omnipotence.

* See Dr. Jarvis's address before the Hartford Natural History Society, which he repeated at the Wesleyan University.

Moral science appeals to the present happiness of mankind, the order and well-being of society, the establishment and guardianship of public and private rights, the interpretation and application of natural law, the impartial administration of justice, and the regulation of human conduct in thousands of cases which statutes could never reach; and we readily admit that "her voice is the harmony of the world." Physical science points to civilization, which she has promoted; to agriculture, commerce, and the mechanic arts, of which she is the common mother; to the accessions she has made to human comfort and convenience; to the powers of nature she has made subservient to man; and she exclaims, "These are my trophies!"

The importance and value of each of these departments of study can be fully sustained and illustrated without derogating in the least from the others. Each is indispensable in its place to complete the structure of education. If one be neglected, a base, a shaft, or a capital is wanting in our column, and the perfection of our edifice is destroyed. I hope, therefore, though my remarks to-day be confined to one class of studies, I shall not be charged with blindness to the merits of others, nor prove myself the younger brother of the insect that thought the narrow leaf on which he existed the utmost extent of the universe.

The business of natural history is to describe and classify. It leaves to chemistry the study of elementary bodies and the laws of their combination, and applies itself to ascertain the properties and relations of all the productions of nature, both organic and inorganic, just as they come from her hand. To name the extent and objects of this science is sufficient to show its importance; and before a society organized expressly for its cultivation to demonstrate its utility would seem a work of supererogation. It would hardly require argument to convince even an uninstructed man that he ought to be acquainted with the properties of those bodies, and the powers of those agents, by which he is constantly surrounded, and deprived of which he could not exist an hour. By every garment we put on, every particle of food that sustains us, every time we tread upon the earth, or open our eyes to the light,—in a word, by every breath we draw, we are reminded of our relations to the natural world and of our dependence upon it. Yet no department of science has been assailed more violently on the charge of inutility, by those men who shape every action with reference to some immediate advantage, than that which introduces man to the beings and objects around him—the glorious mechanism of the same almighty hand that created himself. Many a speculator on the capital bequeathed by philosophy, readily admits the utility of chemistry, mechanics, and astronomy; but meets the naturalist with, "Cui bono?" What! to chase a butterfly with the ardor of an urchin! to gaze with rapture on an insect or a reptile! to inspect the bird-tracks in the sandstones of your beautiful Connecticut with greater care than the western adventurer surveys the site of his future city! to delve for the fossil fishes of your valley with more perseverance than for a mine of gold! to preserve a petrified trilobite as the apple of your eye! to study the skeleton of the megatherium, and the structure of the plesiosaurus, with stronger emotion than a railroad locomotive or the anatomy of a steamboat! What benefit is the

world to derive from the knowledge that the opossum formerly existed in France, and the elephant in America? How much richer is Europe because Cuvier spent his life in articulating the crumbling skeletons which he had rifled from nature's ancient charnel-house? Dull business this to make money. The man whose only divinity is mammon, and who deems nothing useful or beneficial that does not cater for his appetites, or pander for his passions, natural history allures with no golden bribe. Let such men grovel. There are studies worthy of our pursuit for themselves alone—studies which elevate men above considerations of sordid interest, and which surround them with the elements of a new world. To him who is imbued with a philosophic spirit, the contemplation of truth is a sufficient reward of toil. He loves knowledge for its own sake. He claims the same right as others to pursue and enjoy what is to him the highest good. And if men who can appreciate neither his labors nor his motives approach to question or brand him as a votary of unprofitable pursuits, he can retire within himself, wrap himself around with the mantle of his own thoughts, and say, "Procul, O procul este, profani."

The spirit of the old philosophy was selfish and exclusive. To use a favorite expression of our times, it was aristocratic. Having little sympathy with the mass of men, it sought rather to secure a blind veneration for its disciples than to promote the convenience, the comfort, or the improvement of the human race. It labored to make the few more than men, while it left the many less than men. The rival sects of the Greeks and the schoolmen of the middle ages wasted their great powers in subtle and endless speculations, and contributed little substantially useful to the world. Plato contemned the herd of vulgar geometers who condescended to apply mathematical truth to practical purposes, and deemed the science degraded by such slavish and sordid applications. The Roman Seneca was indignant that philosophy had received the insulting eulogy of having assisted in the progress of some of the useful arts; and disdained to dignify with the appellation of philosophers men who happened to be guilty of mechanical inventions. Even Archimedes considered patriotism hardly an adequate apology for stooping from his loftier abstractions to construct those engines for the defence of his city which excited the astonishment of mankind.

On the contrary, the new philosophy, of which Lord Bacon was the founder, is decidedly democratic. While its object is truth, its spirit is philanthropic and diffusive. It looks to the elevation of the whole human family. It seeks so to apply every new truth that men shall be better off for its discovery. Now like most democracies this democratic philosophy has run into some excesses. Because Bacon taught a philosophy which has subserved the interests of the multitude, the multitude now clamor against all philosophy whose utility is not visible, tangible, and immediate. There is a strong tendency in the present age to elevate utility above the love of truth, the subaltern above the superior. The spirit of the Baconian philosophy is misapprehended. Its end is truth; and though it believes whatever is true is useful, and useful because true, yet it pursues truth, not because it is useful, but because it is true.

Were we permitted to yield so far to the spirit and prejudices of this age as to advocate the study of natural history from considera-

tions of utility alone, there would be no "lack of argument" in its favor. We might point to every pharmacopœia, filled with the contributions of botany to medicine. We might point to the animals which have been domesticated; to the fruits and vegetables for the sustenance and clothing of men which have been transplanted and successfully cultivated far from the soil to which they were indigenous; and to the beds of coal, the veins of valuable ores, and the quarries of marble, granite, slate, and other building materials which have been discovered by the aid of this science. It has also literally fed the hungry, clad the naked, warmed the shivering, and healed the sick. Equally with mechanics, chemistry, and astronomy, it has contributed its share toward the advancement of those useful arts which, by supplying the increasing wants of men with diminished labor, afford them the time and the means for mental improvement. For though every man who practices a useful art does not necessarily understand the science on which it is based, yet the development of the law by the man of science usually precedes the application of the principle by the man of business. To illustrate: every builder does not understand the principles of architecture. An apprenticeship has taught him to imitate his models and move in the beaten track. But who gave him his models? Who struck out the lines of beauty, fixed the proportions of symmetry, and from the ideal fabric in his own mind reared the perfect structure for the builder to imitate? The veriest blockhead of a druggist's boy can now make matches that will kindle by friction; but did he perform so easy a labor who discovered the phosphorus in which they are dipped? Many processes perfectly simple and plain when once known, cost wearisome toil and patient thought to discover. Any navigator can now make a voyage to America. It required a Columbus to make the first.

Again: the conditions of our own existence, the structure and organization of our bodies, the influence of natural agents on our health and life, and the consequent importance of temperance, exercise, regular habits, fresh air, proper food, drink, sleep, clothing, and shelter, constitute a branch of physical knowledge intimately connected with our well-being in this life. Does any one, running, like the ancient sages, from utilitarianism to the opposite extreme, pronounce these matters of trivial moment, because they directly affect our bodies only? To eat, drink, dress, and sleep, are, we admit, rather vulgar employments; but we cannot survive a single week without them. So long, then, as they are indispensable to our existence, is it a small matter that they be properly done? Facts abundantly prove that, as a general statement, when the body is in health the mind is active and vigorous; but when diseased, the mind sympathizes with it, droops, and languishes. If, then, the highest state of mental efficiency is usually found connected with the most perfect state of physical health, it follows that whatever injures our physical health will also diminish our mental efficiency. But a knowledge of our relations to the material world assures us that nothing so soon affects our health as the improper performance of those acts of daily recurrence which our own comfort and the desire of self-preservation oblige us to perform. He, therefore, who would preserve the powers of his mind in health and strength must attend to these vulgar things. If he do not, the neglected tenement

will be shattered and tumble into ruins, and the occupant will be crushed beneath the wreck. He has violated the conditions on which health and life are granted; and though his error were the error of ignorance, and not of design, he must pay the penalty of the infraction. In this manner how many whose anticipations once were bright, who gave ample promise of becoming ornaments of the age in which they lived, of adding something to the amount of human knowledge, and of enrolling their names among the benefactors of mankind, withered from the earth in the very beginning of their career! I will cite no example. To many present all aids of remembrance were unnecessary and obtrusive. Suggestion to them is more eloquent than language. You need no example so long as from beneath yonder marble monument "where sleeps the loved and lost of earth," comes forth a silent voice to attest the truth of my words.*

Few perhaps would be disposed to question these general statements as to the utility of physical studies, but if we descend to the minuter details of science, objectors multiply. To devote a life to the examination of a single class of insects or plants which are apparently valueless, or to the study of the structure and habits of microscopic animalculæ, seems to most men an enormous waste of time. But who, I would ask, is to decide what may or may not prove useful hereafter? A discovery unimportant in itself may be the thread that shall guide to another, of inestimable value. To the true philosopher nothing is trivial. The oscillations of a chandelier led to the invention of the pendulum, and the fall of an apple to the discovery of the laws of gravitation. Even the pursuit of a visionary object may lead to important practical results. The alchemists for many centuries tantalized the world with delusive hopes of exhaustless riches and universal health. Though they failed to satisfy the expectations of cupidity, they were the inventors of useful apparatus, the discoverers of powerful agents, the fathers of experiment, and from the ashes of their exploded science modern chimistry has sprung.

While a science is yet progressive, and before its more remote and hidden relations have been traced, so far is the world from being able to judge of its utility, that the philosopher himself can seldom appreciate the full importance of his own labors. Little did the first observer of the properties of loadstone imagine that same attractive influence would afterward be used to direct the mariner on the ocean and the wanderer in the desert. The discovery of the properties of steam was apparently a matter of small consequence; but mark the applications of this knowledge in our age. Galvani observed that the contact of silver and steel produced contractions in animal fibres. Volta succeeded in developing the new agent in sufficient quantities to produce surprising results on the human system. Davy applied the same agent to deflagrate the most refractory bodies, and to overcome the most obstinate affinities. Oersted discovered its power to deflect the magnetic needle, and to magnetize the conductors along which it passed. Succeeding philosophers have developed the laws of electro-dynamics, and applied the principles of electro-magnetism to the production of rotary motion.

* Aaron H. Hurd, of Reach, Upper Canada, who died at the Wesleyan University, in 1836.

Think you Galvani dreamed that his discovery was the first step to so magnificent results? Dare we, even at this day, assign limits to the benefits mankind may yet derive from it?

One more example, drawn from another department of science. The immortal John Kepler was regarded by his contemporaries as an enthusiast, wrapped up in futile dreams about the celestial harmonies, raked from the ashes of the Pythagorean philosophy.—Without friends, without assistance, without sympathy, chilled by poverty, and emaciated by hunger, he toiled on in his abstruse investigations. Mark him at his midnight study. The agony of intense thought is thrilling along his trembling nerves. Anon a ray from the light of truth darts through the shadows of doubt that envelop his mind, and see how his eye flashes with unearthly joy! how his breast dilates with excessive emotion! Hope renewed, still on he toils. Look again. The day is dawning. The morning twilight streaks the east. The clouds of uncertainty vanish from his mind, and truth's bright sun pours a full blaze of light upon his soul. He starts up in transport, and exclaims, "Nothing can restrain me; I yield to the sacred phrensy; I have stolen the golden vessels of the Egyptians, and I will build of them a tabernacle to my God." He has written a book—a book which he knows the coming generations will read, though it fall unnoticed upon his own. He is content "it should wait a century for a reader, if God had waited six thousand years for an observer."* And long after the sublime soul of Kepler had fled from the discordances of earth, to listen in heaven to the harmonies of the spheres, his book did find a reader. Newton rose, and the *three laws of Kepler*† were the basis on which he reared his own stupendous fabric.

If an apology is necessary for devoting so much time to the discussion of utility as a motive to exertion in scientific pursuits, it may be found in the tendencies of our own age and people. My aim has been to give the motive due consideration, but to hold it always subordinate to the love of truth. In the breast of the real philosopher truth holds an empire whose throne no aspirant can usurp. In her revered presence he breathes a purer atmosphere, and is illuminated with a clearer light. When he has discovered a new fact, or a new law, he feels that he has approached one step nearer to that infinite intelligence which he can never reach. But the feeling is not one of pride or self-exaltation. At every step of his advance he has a wider view of the immensity of that untrodden space which still separates him from Omniscience. He regards the laws of nature as the Creator's modes of operation in the material world. The study of nature, then, is the study of God, and the knowledge of his relations to the material world is the knowledge of his physical relations to the great Author of all. Humility and awe penetrate and pervade his soul as in the palpable presence of Divinity.

Another class of motives to physical studies is drawn from the

* *Si ignoscitis, gaudeo; si succensetis, feram; jacio in aleam, librumque scribo, seu presentibus, seu posteris legendum, nihil interest; exceptet ille suum lectorem per annos centum; si Deus ipse per annorum sena millia contemplatorem praestolatus est.*—*Harmonices Mundi, Præmium*, lib. v.

† *Regulae Kepleri.* 1. The planets move in ellipses of which the sun is in one of the foci. 2. The radii vectores describe equal sectors in equal times. 3. The squares of the times of revolution of the planets are as the cubes of their mean distances from the sun.

beneficial effect of these studies upon the mind. And allow me here to remark, these motives address themselves with peculiar force to young men whose mental and moral habits are not yet perfectly formed, and to those, if any be present, who are still hesitating as to their future pursuits, and the kind of mental training suited to the work of preparation. In this connection I shall briefly consider the influence of the study of nature, first, upon the intellectual, and, secondly, upon the moral character.

That formation of intellectual habits, usually called mental discipline, is more important to the scholar than the actual amount of knowledge acquired during a course of study. This discipline is the foundation on which he is to erect his superstructure. It enables him to pursue, by his own unaided powers, any science, and to investigate any subject to which he may apply himself in future life. It teaches him to command his attention, to concentrate his strength, and to remove the obstacles he meets with by patient reliance on his own resources. Doubtless every department of study, rigidly and faithfully pursued, is favorable to this discipline. But the science of nature seems peculiarly adapted to the cultivation of those habits of thought and reasoning which fit men for the duties and emergencies of this plain, matter-of-fact world in which they live. It is a science in which the most perfect order, method, and system prevail; and which deals in realities, rather than abstractions and hypotheses—in things which are, rather than things which might be, or which we imagine ought to be. It exercises the faculties which men have most frequent occasion to employ in the affairs of life. Attention, memory, judgment, and the powers of analysis and classification, it calls into constant and vigorous action. It suffers us not to indulge in speculative vagaries, which

“Lead to bewilder and dazzle to blind.”

Its logic never teaches sophistry for reasoning, nor permits us to contend for victory rather than truth. In fine, if careful observation of phenomena, diligent collection and collation of facts, accurate delineation of properties, bold induction and far-reaching generalization can prepare the mind for noble achievements, then, without question, the man who has studied and understood the relations established by the Creator in the natural world, will be most competent to trace and illustrate the laws impressed by the same Being on the world of mind and morals. The science of mind is yet brooded by the incubus of scholastic philosophy. And if MIND is ever to be extricated from the labyrinth of logomachies which have been piled above and around her, NATURE must furnish the thread that shall guide her to the light.

I have condensed my remarks on the influence of physical studies upon the intellect, that I might have a more reasonable claim to your indulgence while I dilate more upon their moral influence. If we examine the lives and character of men eminent in natural science, we shall find them, with rare exceptions, conspicuous for moral integrity. In Linnæus, in Werner, in our own lamented Godman, and in many others who have made the study of nature the business of their lives, we are charmed with a simplicity of manners, a kindness of heart, a purity of sentiment, an elevation of principle, and an integrity of purpose, which seem to have been

nurtured and matured by the pursuits to which they were devoted. There is in these studies an innocence, a silent, unobserved, but constant influence, which purifies the soul from the gross and sensual, and surrounds it with a healthful moral atmosphere. The habits of mind formed by contemplation of the order and harmony of nature readily extend to the observance and love of those moral harmonies in which virtue consists.

After the love of virtue, the next strongest restraint from vice is the fear of punishment. Though a man have no desire to practice virtue for her own sake, if he understand the laws of his physical being, he knows that every violation of these laws will be followed, sooner or later, by inevitable and severe retribution. It is just as certain that habits of licentiousness, intemperance, or excess of any kind will introduce derangement into the physical economy as that a dose of arsenic will cause pain and death. But he who is ignorant of those laws may give loose reins to passion and appetite, and if he escape present suffering may think he is safe. He knows not that from the seed he is now sowing will spring up, as from the fabled dragon's teeth, an armed host to torment his advancing years. He rushes on blindly, and therefore has nothing to restrain him. The man of science, on the contrary, when perhaps no principle of moral goodness would be strong enough to deter him, might be held back from ruin by his knowledge that the day of reckoning, though late, must come.

Again: the principle of curiosity is a part of our constitution, and its moral tendency depends on the character of the objects of its gratification. Directed to frivolous or vicious objects, its perverted strength becomes a fearful instrument of moral desolation. Its victim listens to the tongue of slander, and forthwith his own drips with the same venom. He enters among scenes of expensive amusement and corrupting pleasure. He looks on vice to assure himself of her deformity, and then clasps her to his familiar bosom. Over every new form of wickedness and crime the morbid principle gloats with insatiate delight. But nature, from her varied storehouse, can furnish aliment to keep curiosity ever active, yet ever healthy. Is it pleased with simple and quiet beauty? The rivers, the groves, the fields, and hills teem with unnumbered objects for its innocent gratification. Does it love the grand and the terrific? The tornado, the earthquake, and the volcano will satisfy it. Does it seek the new and the romantic? The vast volume of entire nature is a novel that never cloys; and whether we view the skill of the plot, the variety of incidents, the fitness of the arrangement, or the beauty of the illustrations, we find the book unsurpassed and inimitable. Does curiosity delight to roam with the antiquary among the monuments of ages past? Nature reveals wonders older than man himself. And if there is a noble pleasure in examining coins and medals, deciphering inscriptions, and surveying ruins, which are the only authentic annals of some remote age and country, how much nobler to read the hieroglyphics imprinted on the everlasting hills by the finger of God himself! to study the wrecks of ancient worlds, the relics of organic bodies, which, long before "man was seen walking with countenance erect," filled the air, the earth, and the waters with the hum of joyous life, the voices of love, and the conflicts of carnivorous belligerents! Champolion sought the secrets of four thousand

years in the tombs of buried Pharaohs ; but the sublimer genius of Cuvier untombed and translated the records of the world, compared with which the learning of Egypt was a bawble of yesterday ; and

" Backward to the birth
Of time itself adventurous trod,
And in the mingled mass of earth
Found out the handiwork of God."

Curiosity delves in the ashes of Pompeii and Herculaneum for specimens of ancient art and illustrations of ancient customs. But in the study of nature it has a wider scope ; to unbury the history of extinct races of animated beings, and to trace the gradual progress of this residence of man from its primitive chaos to order, consistence, and solidity. Curiosity numbers the broken columns of the Parthenon, measures the dimensions of the Coliseum, and admires the sculptured relics of Phidias and Praxiteles. But nature shows the grander architecture of the mountains and the bolder sculpture of the rocks. Do men admire the power and perseverance that reared the massy pyramids, and will they not ask what mighty force rent asunder the crust of the globe, and upheaved mountains, islands, and continents from the bed of the primeval ocean ? In contemplation of such a succession of existences and convulsions we feel that man is indeed "of yesterday, and knoweth nothing." We seem to wander through eternity, to explore the secrets of creation, yea, almost to hold converse with the "Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters."

The study of natural science is also favorable to virtue, because it opens to the aspiring a safe path to honorable reputation. The desire of distinction, so strong in most men, if directed to proper objects, and restricted within the necessary bounds, is certainly right and commendable. A writer whose political career has excited much more notice than his poetry, has said,—

" Teach not your children then to shun ambition,
Nor quench the flame that must for ever burn ;
But, in the days of infancy, their vision
To deeds of virtue and of glory turn."

This principle of action, however, often leads through devious and dangerous roads. The prize is sought by some in the mad schemes which agitate and paralyze society ; by others, in the clamors of party strife, in the fierce conflicts for political aggrandizement, and in the perilous struggle for military renown. But all these paths are thickly set with snares ; and few, very few pass through them unscathed. Even literary pursuits have wrecked the morals of many a brilliant genius, and left melancholy monuments of perverted talents. Before a young man rushes into the midst of temptation, and, boastful of his fancied strength, deems that virtue worthless which has been nurtured where no motives to forsake her are confronted, he well may pause.

But in the study of nature the aspirant for distinction meets few temptations to deviate from moral rectitude. Here he may attain his end without sacrificing integrity to selfishness. Here he need not fear to be honest, lest he should not become honorable. Better would it be for the young men of our country, and for our country itself, were they less eager to plunge into the whirlpool of politics and speculation. There the race is not always to the swift, nor the

battle to the strong. He often wins who makes the most irreparable of all sacrifices to his object—the sacrifice of principle. But here merit is sure of its recompense—a recompense, too, unsullied by the shadow of remorse. There, if success attend him, he will sit on those tarnished seats of honor to which, perhaps, a reptile has wormed his tortuous way before him, and where he must feel degraded as a man by the measures he is compelled to advocate as a partisan. Here he can walk erect in the proud integrity of virtue, gain a name more enviable than the civic crown of the modern demagogue, secure pleasures which wealth can never purchase, and reap rewards compared with which the soldier's laurel, reeking with tears and blood, withers and fades.

An objection has been sometimes urged against physical studies, that they lead to infidelity; and a catalogue of the names of infidel philosophers has been arrayed to support the charge. To this it may be answered, if the question is to be settled by the authority of names, the charge can be easily met. For every name of an eminent natural philosopher who has rejected Christianity, we can produce two equally eminent who have embraced and defended it. The argument, however, seems to be defective. When it is alleged that certain philosophers were unbelievers, unless it can be proved that their favorite studies made them so, we cannot infer that the same studies have a tendency to make others so. But where is the proof that the pursuit of physical studies was the cause of unbelief in any one of these philosophers? If the argument prove any thing, it proves too much. Let us apply it to other cases, and see to what it would lead. It was stated a few years since that all the professors of theology in a celebrated German university were infidels: therefore theological studies lead to infidelity! Unbelievers have been found in every department of philosophy: therefore all science leads to infidelity! If to correct the gross ideas entertained by many of God, his attributes, and his works, and to eradicate superstitious and ridiculous notions from the minds of men, lead to infidelity, then indeed these, in common with all liberal studies, do lead to infidelity. Science has certainly uprooted many absurd and foolish opinions, and made men rational on a variety of subjects. Superstition once saw in the secret arts of magic the agency of invisible demons. Science has exhibited the same phenomena, and given their simple and obvious rationale. Superstition regarded thunder as the rumbling of the chariot wheels of Jupiter careering in the clouds and hurling his bolts upon the affrighted earth. Science has shown that this sound is produced by the concussion of the air after the passage of the electrical discharge. Superstition looked upon comets as the terrific harbingers of impending calamities. Science has shown them to be harmless as the planets, and obedient to the same laws. Superstition saw in the aurora borealis the conflicts of embattled armies, the flickering of crimson swords, and "garments rolled in blood." Science declares this phenomenon to be caused by the passage of diffused electricity through the rarefied regions of the atmosphere. Superstition believed the earthquake portentous of wrath, when Olympus trembled beneath the rod of its despot. Science demonstrates that it is caused by the operation of subterranean agents, in accordance with chimal laws. But while science refers these phenomena to natural laws, she teaches men to stop

not here; to look beyond secondary causes to the great First Cause of all—the Being who spoke these laws into existence, and impressed them on the material world. If

“The undevout astronomer is mad,”

how much more is that man mad who can contemplate the great order of universal nature, the unerring regularity and uniformity of her operations, and trace the evidences of design and intelligence through

“Beast, bird, fish, insect, what no eye can see,
No glass can reach,”

and still deny the existence and government of a supreme and all-creative God!

Another reason why science is charged with leading to infidelity is the apparent incongruity sometimes found to exist between its conclusions and certain passages in the Holy Scriptures, as generally explained and understood. Galileo was immured in the dungeons of the inquisition for asserting the truth of the Copernican system, because that system was supposed to be incompatible with revelation. Yet the earth moved on!* Hutton, Leslie, and Playfair were assailed with all the virulence of prejudice for declaring that the earth must have been created “in the beginning,” and not six thousand years ago, when man was placed upon it. Yet now many eminent theologians in Europe and America are foremost in asserting the same. It does seem that the triumph of the Copernican astronomy over the bigotry of the Romish Church, and the more recent triumph of the modern geogony, might teach men the folly of arraying a preconceived construction of language in opposition to the established truths of science. To take alarm at every new discovery, lest it controvert some popular interpretation of the sacred record, shows for religion a “zeal not according to knowledge.” Truth is always consistent with itself. A truth in natural science can no more contradict the revelation of God than God can contradict himself. And still more, a truth in science, once demonstrated, as peremptorily challenges belief as the voice of the Almighty from the thunders and thick darkness of Sinai. Nature and revelation go hand in hand; and each rightly understood becomes an unerring commentary on the other. When the expounders of the Bible shall have learned how far its language is to be construed according to the exact letter, and how far it conformed to the state of human knowledge at the time it was delivered, no inconsistency will be found between the sacred volume and

“That elder scripture writ by God’s own hand.”

The last class of motives to the study of natural science which I shall notice, is drawn from the desire felt by every patriotic American to promote the reputation of his country. The firmest basis of a nation’s honor must be laid in the minds of its people. We would see the land of our birth and our affections rising as rapidly in scientific fame as in wealth and political power. Yet we know that the genius of our institutions forbids us to expect from the general

* “E pur si muove,” were the indignant words of Galileo after he had been compelled to pronounce the prescribed formula of abjuration: “*Corde sincero et fide non fletu abjurso, maledico et detestor supradictos errores et hereses.*”

government any direct assistance in those pursuits which, being productive of no adequate emolument, most of all require liberal patronage. The monarchists of Europe have declared our institutions hostile to all such pursuits, and have confidently predicted our utter neglect of them. Now as lovers of our country and its system of government, does it not behoove us to show to the world that "*men constitute a state;*" and what kings, princes, and nobles can do in Europe, *men* can do here?

We could, indeed, wish our government more disposed to countenance scientific men and scientific pursuits. We could wish to possess a national garden of plants and a national cabinet of natural history which should rival even those of Paris. But so long as government is the creature it will be also the instrument of the people's will. When the popular mind shall have been instructed, and the popular taste rightly directed, the public voice will demand what now it would reject. Thus to change the people's will must be the work of time and patient perseverance. At present, as heretofore, the advancement of natural history must depend on the efficiency of individual exertions. If the speedy dissolution of great estates among us, in consequence of the abrogation of the laws of primogeniture, will not permit single individuals to exercise princely munificence, it enables a much greater number to contribute with generous liberality. Combination, therefore, must accomplish in America what patronage has done in Europe. The numerous associations which are springing up in every part of our land for the cultivation of natural history are scattering their influence over the whole face of the community. And we need not despair of seeing in a few years multitudes of farmers, miners, seamen, and soldiers, and even the hunters of the Rocky Mountains, as well as the more liberally educated classes of engineers, travelers, and military and naval officers, so far interested and instructed in this pleasing science as to be induced to preserve the specimens which they have so many opportunities to procure.

The success of the cultivators of natural history in our country, for a few years past, affords most cheering encouragement for the future. Even so late as the close of the last war how few were the laborers in this broad and fertile field! Yet they sat not down in hopeless inactivity. The magnitude of the work to be done nerved them with greater strength. They yielded to no difficulties, and shrank from no sacrifices. Would you see the results of their labors? Look abroad over the land, and they will meet you in every respectable college, in every populous city, even in many small towns and private houses. Many of the states have contributed much to science by directing geological surveys within their limits, and in some cases these surveys have extended to all departments of natural history. Even the general government has exhibited an occasional though hesitating disposition to promote, as far as its limited powers will allow, the same great objects.

Among the early pioneers of natural science in this country a neighboring venerable institution in your own state can boast one of the most persevering and most successful. The American Journal of Science and Arts, undertaken with dubious auspices, and prosecuted with disheartening sacrifices, has done more for the cause of science in our country than can be well estimated. This rich

depository of valuable intelligence, this table-companion for every scientific American, is an imperishable monument of the industry and rare ability of its learned editor. I should do injustice to the feelings of gratitude which flow spontaneously from a pupil to an accomplished and revered instructor, should I not also mention in this connection the name of Professor Cleaveland, who published the first edition of his *Mineralogy* in 1816. This, with the subsequent enlarged and improved edition, gave a new impulse to that science in this country; and the estimation in which the work is held is best shown by the clamorous importunity of the public for a third edition. In other departments of natural history brilliant lights soon arose. Though cut off in the midst of his unfinished labors, Dr. Godman has left, in his *History of North American Quadrupeds*, a noble specimen of what might have been expected from his maturer researches and later studies. And more recently Mr. Audubon, by his admirable *Biography of Birds*, has placed himself in the first rank of ornithologists. The labors of these men, and of many others whom the limits of this address will not permit me to name, have rapidly diffused a spirit of inquiry and a correct taste on these subjects. They have allured many ardent disciples into the same paths. They have laid the foundation of an enduring reputation, both for themselves and their country. Americans are learning from them what they have to do, what they can do, and how to do it. And while we are ever ready to award merited praise to scientific foreigners who labor among us, we are resolved to be no longer dependent upon them to explore our mineral wealth, and to describe and classify our plants and animals.

I have thus, gentlemen, very imperfectly, I am aware, presented for your consideration three classes of motives to exertion in the study of natural science, and more particularly of natural history: 1. The motives drawn from considerations of utility; 2. From the intellectual and moral influence of these studies; 3. From their bearing on the reputation of our country.

It now only remains to show the spirit by which the philosopher of nature should be impelled in the prosecution of his objects. Let no one who enters this delightful path hope to be released from the conditions on which all knowledge is gained. It was a remark of the wise Socrates, "The gods have given nothing valuable to men without great labor." On this subject the wisdom of antiquity has not yielded to modern innovation and improvement. In no department of learning has a railroad yet been constructed. No power of locomotion can whirl us to the desired goal. If we trace the history of those lights of science which have shone most conspicuously in the fields of original discovery, we shall find they owed their success to an ardent love of their pursuits, to a noble disregard of self, and to firm purpose and resolute exertion. I would say, therefore, that the spirit of the naturalist should be a spirit of perseverance, self-devotedness, and enthusiasm. He must see no other object of ambition; he must be allured by no other enchanter. To the end in view he must not only cheerfully but exultingly devote his time and his talents, and, next after the preparation for an immortal state, must make it the business of his life. The great Linnæus, in pursuit of botanical knowledge, traversed on foot the frozen mountains of Lapland; and in England fell on his knees in

ecstasy at sight of the golden bloom of the furze of Putney heath. "Dr. Godman," observes his biographer, "has been heard to say, that in investigating the habits of the shrew mole he walked many hundred miles." The same writer also says, "His eagerness in the pursuit of knowledge seemed like the impulse of gnawing hunger and unquenchable thirst. Neither adversity nor disease could allay it." Mr. Audubon, in preparing his splendid work upon ornithology, has evinced the same zealous enthusiasm and the same indomitable perseverance, whether we follow him under the broiling sun of Louisiana, or over the vast prairies of the western wilderness, or amid the rocks, and ice, and desolation of the Labrador coast. Speaking of Wilson's great work on the same subject, Dr. De Kay remarks,* "The peculiar disadvantages under which Wilson labored would have dampened and discouraged any spirit but his own. His ardent enthusiasm for his favorite pursuits, and his noble disdain of the most appalling obstacles, are finely exhibited in his reply to a friend who endeavored to dissuade him from the publication of his work, 'I shall at least leave a beacon to show where I perished.'"

Such, gentlemen, are the models for the imitation of the naturalist who would strive for eminence or hope for success. Such is the enthusiasm he must feel; such the devotedness with which he must render himself to the work; such the spirit that must dwell and reign within him.

A recent youthful but ingenious writer has compared science to an immense horizontal column, which successive generations of philosophers are raising to a perpendicular position. The first rear it as high as they can reach, and leave it so. Their successors, to lift it higher, must be taller and stronger men than themselves; and every succeeding generation must surpass the last, or the column can never go up. Were this a true simile, the prospect of the successors of Davy and Berzelius, Laplace and Lagrange, Herschel and Cuvier, to heave the column any higher must be alarmingly dubious! The comparison, however, will not hold. The truth is, every succeeding generation of philosophers stand on the shoulders of those who went before them. Though they be only equal in stature, they still overtop their predecessors, and push up the column a little higher. We begin where our fathers ended. We have the benefit of their labors and discoveries. They are the pillars which support the stage we stand on. They place in our hands the instruments to work with; and we go on toward the accomplishment of the labors they commenced.

Let no man, therefore, sit down disheartened, and persuade himself that all has been done which can be done. It is not so. There are yet crowns reserved for him who is willing to practice the limb and strain the muscle. The boundless fields of nature have not yet been all explored. Many a wide tract still invites. When the gigantic mind of Newton compared what he had done with what he had left undone, he declared he had only "picked up a few pebbles on the shore of the great ocean of truth." Have we then the presumption to think its remotest limits have been explored? The earth, how little has she yet revealed of her deeply hidden and exhaustless treasures! But we penetrate a few hundred feet beneath her outer-

* See Dr. De Kay's Address before the New-York Lyceum of Natural History.

most crust, and dream we have displayed the secrets of her capacious bosom. The sea, what wonders hitherto unseen are stored in her profound abysses! Yet we glide over her surface, and vaunt ourselves her lords. The atmosphere, how little do we know of its tornadoes and its meteors, its changes of pressure, temperature, and moisture, and the other processes of its ethereal laboratory! Yet we ascend a few miles in a balloon, and arrogate to ourselves the fabled dominion of Jupiter! How imperfectly do we understand the nature and connection of those powerful and mysterious agents, heat, electricity, and magnetism! Yet we construct an electro-magnetic engine, and proclaim nature the handmaid of our will! How many links are yet undiscovered in the great chain of being! But we flatter ourselves that the Flora, the *Sylva*, and the Fauna of the world are almost complete. The abstruse problem of reason and instinct is yet unsolved. The great question, "*What is life?*" is yet unanswered. But I forbear. It is at least a sufficient cause of humility to perceive how much less extended is the catalogue of our knowledge than the catalogue of our ignorance. The former can easily be told; the latter we have not even knowledge to make out.

For the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review.

**ART. VII.—TREASURES OF KNOWLEDGE LAID OPEN BY AN
ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE ANCIENT CLASSICS.**

BY CHARLES H. LYON,

Associate Principal of the Irving Institute, Tarrytown, N. Y.

THE history of literature and science is but the record of the progress of the human mind in the attainment of knowledge. In ancient times, while the mental powers were not yet developed, and the state of knowledge was rude, the minds of men were exercised in a different way in literary and scientific pursuits from that in which they now are, and in a manner more favorable to the development of genius. Few discoveries, comparatively, had then been made, and but little aid could be derived in the pursuit of one branch of knowledge from the advances made in another. Those principles of science that are now applied in the trades and arts, and in the ordinary business of life, had not yet been developed. There was, therefore, a greater demand for investigation and research, as the progress of the arts depended on the advancement of science. Men had to proceed step by step to arrive at one result before they could employ it in obtaining others, and to make one discovery the stepping stone to more. They were required to bring their powers more to a focus, and direct them more to single objects, and this is, in fact, the secret of success in all mental operations. Hence there is more originality and inventive genius in the productions of antiquity than in those of our own time; and the writers of real merit among the ancients bore a far higher ratio to the whole number than they do at the present day.

Yet valuable and important as those productions are, they are comparatively inaccessible to a vast majority of the reading community of the present age. The poetry, the philosophy, the history, and the eloquence of the ancient world are treasured up in the lan-

guages of Greece and Rome. The accumulated wisdom of ages, the productions of the human mind for many successive centuries, are locked up for ever in those tongues. We say locked up for ever, for we believe it impossible to translate the *mind* of a writer into a foreign language. Works of genius are, by an irrevocable necessity, sealed up in the vernacular tongue of their authors. He who would *commune* with the spirits of antiquity must master the language in which they thought.

But let us inquire in what particular departments of knowledge we may derive pleasure and instruction from the writings of the ancients.

1. In respect to *physical science*, it cannot, indeed, be denied that the moderns, who, in the very outset of their inquiries, could avail themselves of all the ancients knew, have, by that advantage, been able to make greater advances, and to obtain more numerous and important results, than the latter. But it should not be forgotten to what extent modern science, in its infancy, was dependent on that literature which some of its votaries now scruple not to decry. It has been justly remarked that "the fate of science is inseparable from that of letters; which, as they gave it birth, so do they continue to afford it nourishment." And it is found that, even at this day, the works of ancient naturalists are far from being destitute of interest and of value to scientific men. "The Greeks," says Professor Moore, "were acute observers; and when they conducted their inquiries in the true method of experiment, their writings, even on subjects of natural science, still maintain the highest value. Buffon and Cuvier bear testimony to the accuracy, the perspicuity, and order of Aristotle's History of Animals: the former declaring that it is perhaps to this time the best work in its kind that we possess; that it appears this ancient knew the animal creation better, and under more general views than it is known to us at the present day; that none other than a genius like his own could have comprehended such an infinite variety of facts within such narrow compass, and treated a subject so little susceptible of precision with so much perspicuity and order; that if science be the history of facts, his work is the most scientific abridgment that ever yet was made."

2. In *grammar, rhetoric, and philology*, in all that relates to the philosophy of language, the ancient critics, those of Greece in particular, were unsurpassed in profound, original, and, in general, accurate views. To this branch of science, indeed, more attention was paid among the ancients, and greater proficiency appears to have been made in it, than at any subsequent period. The study of language was cultivated with the utmost care and attention in the earliest days of literature and science, while it has declined among the moderns, and been suffered to fall into comparative neglect. "Few writers of ability have turned their thoughts to the subject, and but little has been added, either in respect of matter, or of system, to what the ancients have left us." Since the days of Aristotle who has rivaled him in subtilty of invention and power of analysis? If his theory of logic, after swaying the public mind for a long succession of ages, at length gave place to a more enlightened system; yet his rhetoric and poetics, as well as his politics and ethics, have lost none of their credit, but have continued to rise in the estimation of scholars. Since the time of Longinus, what writer can be said to have surpassed him in learned and philosophical criticism? And

who since the age of Quintilian has treated the subjects embraced in his *Institutes* with greater soundness of judgment and purity of taste? There is not a man living, however conversant with these branches and distinguished for general scholarship, who would not, if yet unacquainted with these authors, derive much valuable instruction from the study of them.

3. In the matter of *civil history* the productions of the ancients are to be viewed, not only as the almost exclusive, and therefore invaluable sources of information relating to the times of which they treat, but as illustrating the customs, institutions, and opinions of mankind during a long period of the progress of civil culture and of the development of national character. The great importance of the subjects embraced in so long a succession of ages is fully equalled by the character of the writers who have treated of them. In all the traits essential to a good historian, the ancient models are, most of them, justly regarded as holding the first rank.

In a production distinguished alike for the beauty of its style and the importance of its subject-matter, the "father of profane history" has bequeathed to mankind "a work including the history of many centuries, and comprehending the greatest kingdoms and empires of the ancient world. This extensive subject is handled with order and dignity. The episodes are ingeniously interwoven with the principal action. The various parts of the narrative are so skilfully combined that they mutually reflect light on each other. Geography, manners, religion, laws, and arts enter into the plan of the work; and it is remarkable that the earliest of historians agrees more nearly, as to the design and form of his undertaking, with the enlightened writers of the present century than any historical author in the long series of intervening ages."*

From the pen of *Thucydides* we have the annals of twenty-one years of the Peloponnesian war. The accuracy, impartiality, and fidelity of that author, as well as the "force of imagination, vigor of language, depth of reasoning, and clearness of conception," which Cicero ascribes to him are acknowledged and praised by critics ancient and modern. The record which he has left of one of the most interesting eras of antiquity possesses a value and importance that can scarcely be overrated.

For a continuation of that record, embracing the remaining history of the Peloponnesian war, we are indebted to the labors of *Xenophon*. The ornate and graceful style, the philosophic spirit, and the instructive morality, which distinguish his productions, rank him also in the first class of historians. "The soldier has always admired his talents in conducting, and the scholar in describing, the *retreat of the ten thousand*; and the philosopher and statesman have alike been delighted with his charming work denominated the *Cyropaedia*."†

Among the Romans the names of *Sallust*, *Livy*, and *Tacitus* have contributed, perhaps, in an equal degree, to the beauty, dignity, and value of *their* national literature. The first named author, from his numerous and just reflections, has by some been considered the father of philosophic history. The subjects of which he has treated form two of the most important and prominent topics in the history of Rome, and in his manner of treating them he has done justice to

* Gillie's History of Greece. † Dr. Robertson.

their importance. The portion of Livy's voluminous history which the moderns have been so fortunate as to recover from oblivion, as well as the ably written *annals* of Tacitus, is distinguished for purity of style, dignity of sentiment, and depth of reflection, and derive still greater value from the important character of the times and events which they describe.

These and other productions of nearly equal merit that have survived the desolation of the middle ages, are so many monuments of the wisdom and ability of the ancients; and, what is of more consequence, they are so many records of events and transactions the knowledge of which can be gleaned from no other sources.

4. In *poetry* the works of antiquity are still pre-eminent. If it be contended by some that the names of *Shakspeare* and *Milton*, of *Dante* and *Tasso*, and a few others, have redeemed the verse of modern times from the reproach of inferiority to the ancient standard, it may still be urged, and cannot be denied, that the *average merit* of ancient genius excels that of any subsequent period; that the proportion of genuine poetry to the whole mass of metrical productions was far greater in the infancy of literature than it has ever been since. We are disposed, however, to regard some of the *individual poets* of antiquity as superior to any of a later age. Who has yet succeeded in bearing away from Homer the palm of invention, from Virgil the praise of judgment? Who, if we except but a single name, can compare with an *Æschylus*, a *Sophocles*, or a *Euripides* in the walks of tragic verse? In the department of lyric poetry the name of Horace is associated with the nearest approach to perfection ever yet made. "Of all the writers of odes, ancient or modern, there is none that in point of correctness, harmony, and happy expression, can vie with Horace. He has descended from the Pindaric rapture to a more moderate degree of elevation; and joins connected thought and good sense with the highest beauties of poetry."*

5. In *eloquence* the ancient models are admitted to be yet unrivaled. The specimens that remain to us, judging both from their intrinsic merit and from the effects ascribed to them by contemporaneous history, must be allowed to possess more of the essential qualities of perfect oratory than any subsequent productions of a similar kind. There are, indeed, many illustrious names recorded in the history of *modern* eloquence; many who are justly distinguished for having attained the first rank among their contemporaries, and we are very far from denying or depreciating their merit; yet the brightness of their fame is dimmed by the intense splendor of those greater names, those master-spirits, of Grecian and Roman oratory, Demosthenes and Cicero. Let him who would attain to a high standard of oratorical excellence make himself familiar with the ancient masters. This is the more necessary in these days, when public speakers have become so numerous that a higher degree of cultivation is required to raise one above the level of mediocrity. "Native talent, it is true, aided by a moderate degree of cultivation, and improved by much exercise, may make a fluent, nay, perhaps a forcible and persuasive speaker; but the truly great orator, who shall be able not only to instruct and charm his hearers, conciliate their affections, inform their minds, and influence their

* Dr. Blair.

wills, but to pour along an impetuous flood of argument and passion, that shall rise far above mere persuasion, and by its resistless force bear away all that would oppose it: the orator who, by the vivid flashes of his eloquence, shall dazzle and confound his adversaries; by the ingenuity and force of his argument wrest to his purpose the inclinations of his hearers; by the strength and truth of his emotion, and all the combined powers of his art, rouse at pleasure or allay the passions of an assembled people, 'and sway with potent speech the world.' such an orator, in fine, as was Demosthenes never will again exist, unless he shall be formed upon the ancient models."*

6. The *philosophers* of antiquity, though considered for many subsequent ages as little less than divine, and though still admitted to have been (many of them at least) men of splendid intellect and surpassing genius, are nevertheless regarded with but little favor by the present generation. The claim which their works possess to the merit of *practical utility* is considered extremely slight; and this deficiency is the ground of their condemnation. Yet we venture to assert that the study of the ancient philosophers, if properly engaged in, would be attended, in nearly every point of view, with most decided advantage. The object proposed by those teachers of wisdom was indeed a noble one. It was to discover truth, to ascertain and settle the distinctions between right and wrong, to elaborate from the resources of their own minds a correct system of ethics, to lay down principles of conduct, and trace the path of duty for their less enlightened contemporaries; and, in fine, to elevate, strengthen, and dignify the moral and intellectual character of their species: "To observe by what means they who have been engaged in the pursuit and propagation of knowledge have accomplished their design; what obstacles they have overcome; in what instances and from what causes they have been imposed upon by the semblance of truth, and have embraced the shadow for the substance; into what mistakes they have fallen through prejudice, precipitation, or vanity; what inconveniences they have suffered from their misconceptions and errors; and what advantages they have derived from their wisdom, with other circumstances of a similar nature, cannot fail to suggest hints and reflections which may be of great use in the prosecution of science."† The history of philosophy is the history of the human understanding, and it must be in the highest degree interesting and instructive to study the workings of the mind during the earlier stages of its development, and to contemplate the splendid achievements of genius during the period of its youthful vigor. What is there in the history of the intellect to compare with its efforts to search out the character of the Deity without divine aid? When, in the history of the world, has reason without revelation done as much to improve and refine the nature of man as when Socrates taught moral truth, and Plato was revered as the oracle of more than human wisdom?

In every department, then, of valuable knowledge the cultivated mind will find much that is pleasing and instructive in the productions of antiquity. If the history of man in all his various relations, and the history of mind in the successive stages of its development, if the progress of society, and the influences under which it passes

* Dr. Moore. † Enfield's Hist. Phil.

from barbarism to refinement, are profitable subjects of contemplation—if they are sources of useful knowledge, then are the works of the ancients fountains of wisdom. If the truest delineations of character, and the most faithful portraiture of the passions; if the inmost workings of the mind, the loftiest conceptions of the imagination, and the noblest efforts of unaided reason, are fitted to instruct and improve mankind, then indeed are the bequests of a Homer, a Sophocles, an Aristotle, and a Plato, in an eminent degree instructive and useful. It is impossible to survey the extensive field of ancient letters, in all its length, and breadth, and beauty, and to contemplate the character of its intellectual vegetation, without a strong sense of admiration and a strong conviction that the claims of that literature are not overrated, even by its most ardent votaries. “For all that belongs to original genius, to spirited, masterly, and high execution,” says Dr. Blair, “our best and most happy ideas are, generally speaking, drawn from the ancients. In epic poetry, for instance, Homer and Virgil, to this day, stand not within many degrees of any rival. Orators such as Cicero and Demosthenes we have none. In history, notwithstanding some defects, it may be safely asserted, that we have no such historical narration, so elegant, so picturesque, so animated and interesting, as that of Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Livy, Tacitus, and Sallust. Although the conduct of the drama may be admitted to have received some improvements, yet for poetry and sentiment we have nothing to equal Sophocles and Euripides; nor any dialogue in comedy that comes up to the correct, graceful, and elegant simplicity of Terence. We have no such elegies as those of Tibullus; no such pastorals as those of Theocritus; and for lyric poetry Horace stands quite unrivaled. * * * * *

“To all such, then, as wish to form their taste and nourish their genius, let me warmly recommend the assiduous study of the ancient classics, both Greek and Roman.”

Studies that are so strongly recommended by every consideration that can give them value, and by the most respectable scholars and authors of every age, cannot, and we feel assured will not, be long treated with neglect. Indeed, notwithstanding the slow progress of classical learning among us, and the backward state in which it still continues, it is yet in a more flourishing condition than might be expected under the circumstances of the case. When we consider the obstacles with which it has had to contend, and the causes that have operated to retard and depress it, we have reason to be encouraged with its present aspect, and with the degree of attention and respect it has succeeded in winning from “an age so devoted to the pursuit of gain that it regards with little favor what has not a tendency to promote some pecuniary end.” The fact of its having struggled against popular prejudice, ignorance, and envy, and against other influences still more hostile, speaks much in behalf of its intrinsic merit. In truth, the advancement of sound learning, of deep and thorough intellectual culture, (of which classical literature forms an essential part,) cannot be permanently checked by any causes less powerful than such as would arrest the progress of knowledge, and stay the march of the human mind. In proportion as the mass of the people in this country shall become thoroughly enlightened, as the stream of knowledge shall grow deeper, as the literary taste of

the nation shall become sound and elevated, and as improved modes of mental culture shall tend more to produce the harmonizing development of all the faculties, in the same degree this ancient learning will be more appreciated and respected, and more thoroughly incorporated into our systems of education. Our national literature is yet in its youth. As it grows older it will acquire vigor. As our intellectual vision becomes stronger, it will penetrate farther beneath the surface of knowledge, and discover treasures of which it was not before aware.

For the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review.

ART. VIII.—DR. FISK'S TRAVELS.

Travels on the Continent of Europe, &c. By WILBUR FISK, D.D. New-York. Harper & Brothers. 8vo. Pp. 688. 1838.

We hope that few of our readers have omitted to secure for themselves the gratification attendant upon the careful and deliberate perusal of this large, but not too large volume of travels. Some idea of the interest we have found in it may be educed from the fact, that, in examining it for the purpose of review, we find that we have made no less than *sixty-seven* references to passages of so much moment as required comment—if we could by possibility afford the room for quotation and such comment as would be suitable; and this, too, in going over ground that has been so often and so diligently traversed in this age of travel. In truth, to give a fitting review of Dr. Fisk's labors—a review including even a very condensed summary of the numerous and important facts which he has collected, and of the shrewd and striking commentaries upon them which his active mind has suggested, a volume would be necessary; and in the preparation of such a volume it would be a trial, even of critical fortitude, to omit all the pleasing descriptions and entertaining incidents which impart so much of pleasurable animation to his pages.

It may be, and probably will be, a question with some who have not read the work, how it could be possible for any traveler in countries so well known as Italy, France, Germany, Switzerland, and Great Britain, to fill a volume of nearly seven hundred pages with matter at once new, interesting, and important; but the answer to this question will readily present itself to those who are acquainted with the character and habits of the writer: still more readily to those who have followed him in his journeyings, as they and their results are recorded in these pages. Although there have been many travelers in Europe, English as well as American, within the last twelve or fifteen years; and although very many of them have published, yet the fact presents itself with exceeding force to every reader of Dr. Fisk, that there was still much ground remaining to be explored; that ample room was left for an observer possessing qualifications of a peculiar kind, and provided with the inclination as well as the ability for examining in a different spirit and with different objects from those of the majority of travelers. We have had volumes upon volumes—and those, too, from distinguished men—the predominant spirit of which was a mere desire to enter-

tain the reader with glowing descriptions of remarkable objects, or characteristic accounts of national peculiarities, as they present themselves to the stranger; some have been written, also, with the higher view of instruction; but the number of these latter has been comparatively small, and we are constrained to say that very few have come under our observation displaying much comprehensiveness of inquiry or soundness of judgment. It is one of the excellences of the work before us, that it combines with singular felicity *all* the requisites that make a book of travels interesting and valuable. Dr. Fisk possesses that facility of mind, united with generality of knowledge, which qualifies a man, in an eminent degree, for comprehensive and varied observation. All subjects receive his attention, and of all he speaks not only with interest but with understanding, and of course with clearness. He seems equally at home in analyzing the great influences that affect communities and nations, or in the details of a school—in describing the political changes of a kingdom and the proportions of a statue—in discussing the gravest questions of theology and the beauties of natural scenery—in appreciating the refinements of the most polished society and the comforts of a good hotel, or the rustic enjoyments of a swiss village.

But it is in depicting and reasoning upon the great moral features of society in Europe that he exhibits to most advantage his admirable fitness for the highly important work of presenting other countries to the people of his own. For this he was amply qualified by habit and occupation, as well as by the natural bent and powers of his mind. As the president of one of our most distinguished literary institutions, and a minister of the gospel, high in esteem not only among his own denomination, but among all others, it was natural for him to bestow much attention upon the state of morals and religion in the several countries which he visited, and upon all the agencies and circumstances by which these are affected—first among which, of course, ranks education, with the means provided for its improvement. The investigations of Dr. Fisk in this great field of inquiry were unremitting, and conducted, we need scarcely say, in an enlightened spirit and with an intelligence such as was to be expected from his practical acquaintance with the subject and his intimate knowledge of its importance. And the results of his inquiries, as we find them in this volume, do honor to his zeal and his ability, not merely by their extent and accuracy, but by their applicability to the advantage of education in our own country, where, above all others, good and universal education is of the highest importance, because the participation of the people in the conduct of the government, and by consequence in all that affects the national welfare, is most immediate and extensive.

But the religious and moral condition of the various countries through which Dr. Fisk traveled, did not by any means engross his whole attention. He examined them closely, also, in their physical aspects—with reference to their natural and artificial productions, their commerce, manufactures, government, roads, canals, public buildings—in short, every thing that might properly claim the notice of an enlightened and instructed utilitarian; for such is Dr. Fisk, in the highest and most honorable sense of the term, and such must every traveler be who would visit strange lands for his own benefit and that of his countrymen. We acknowledge our obligations to

him for a clearer and more comprehensive idea of the great changes which time and the progress of events are causing in Europe—changes of the most extensive and momentous nature—than we had been able to acquire from much study directed to that especial object, and for a better understanding of many principles now at work among the continental nations, the limit of whose operation it is impossible to foresee, although it is apparent that the consequences of their influence must be of vast importance, not only to those nations but to the whole civilized world.

But there is one excellence about this work which may almost be pronounced peculiar to it, and which gives it a remarkable value in this country. It is the only book, of the comprehensive and utilitarian character to which we have adverted, that has been written, at all events within several years, by one of our own countrymen. And this, when properly understood, will be found a consideration of the very highest moment. It is a consequence of the very constitution of the human mind that every traveler bears with him a standard of comparison erected upon the usages, institutions, manners, &c., of his own country, by which he estimates, sometimes perhaps unconsciously, the usages, institutions, and all other incidents of the lands through which he passes. If he be a man of enlarged and cultivated intellect, he turns this moral necessity of his nature to advantage by noting such peculiarities as may be either adopted or avoided by his own countrymen: guiding all his observations by a constant reference to their advantages and wants, and with an eye always to their mental or physical improvement. Therefore it is that the record of an intelligent and candid American's travel is of far greater value to us than that of a tourist belonging to any other nation, however well qualified by disposition, knowledge, and understanding. We take great pleasure in bearing testimony to the excellent spirit in which Dr. Fisk has performed his duty as an *American* traveler, in reference to this point of national interest and utility. Although he never speaks of other countries, their institutions, or their people, without the courtesy that belongs to the Christian and the gentleman, and is never guilty of the too common fault of decrying and contemning what he finds different from the usages of his own country, merely because it is different, yet he never forgets his native land, or his duties and privileges as one of her children.

But we have to view Dr. Fisk in another capacity. He was appointed by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States to represent that body to the Wesleyan Conference in England. This appointment was alike honorable to him and creditable to the wisdom of the General Conference in the choice of a representative. Few men could have been selected better fitted for the discharge of such a trust.

It is understood that in the elements of their creed and moral discipline, as well as in the general outlines of their economy, Wesleyan Methodists harmonize throughout the world. In regard to these their unanimity is indeed signal, if not without a parallel. These general features of this large and rapidly increasing denomination have acquired a permanency which gives them all the weight and influence of first principles; and the intercourse kept up between the English and American branches of this great Wesleyan

family, through the medium of intelligent and well qualified delegates mutually sent and received by them alternately, based, as it is, upon those fundamental principles which are held sacred alike by both, is calculated to have a happy influence in cherishing and extending that fraternal spirit which subsists between them, and perpetuating the bond of union that holds them together.

It will naturally occur, however, to every reflecting mind, that though these two great branches of the Methodist family build upon the same foundation, and aim at the same object, from the very necessity of the case they must act separately in carrying on their work, and consequently vary considerably in their practice, compelled, as they must be, to conform their plans and systems to the circumstances under which they are severally placed.

It appears, indeed, from that part of the work before us in which Dr. Fisk incidentally adverts to the organization of the British Conference, compared with the institution of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, that Mr. Wesley acted with reference to this discrepancy in their circumstances in providing for each a permanent ecclesiastical establishment. While for the one he furnished a plan embracing all the elements of a regular episcopal organization, under the government and control of a General Conference, and the supervision of general superintendents, &c., he provided to perpetuate the ecclesiastical identity of the other, and to give a legal existence to its powers and functions, by a sort of close corporation in the form of a poll deed, which he executed and caused to be enrolled in the high court of chancery, adapted in all its provisions to the peculiar circumstances in which that primary branch of his growing Connection was placed. With these distinct charts to direct them in the course they were to pursue, while laboring simultaneously for the one object of spreading Scriptural holiness through the land, it is natural to suppose that in the more minute details of their plans of operation much variety may be witnessed. In each of them, probably, errors may be detected which the other has been successful in avoiding; and measures productive of increased efficiency in the common cause may be discovered in the practice of the one, which have been overlooked and neglected by the other. Hence it will be acknowledged that much benefit may result to each by the alternate visitations of well qualified representatives, possessed of both talents and disposition impartially to compare the practices and customs of the two in all their various parts and aspects, and faithfully to report the result of their observations.

With similar views respecting what would probably be expected of him, Dr. Fisk appears to have entered upon his mission as delegate to the British Conference; and he accordingly applied himself with his usual assiduity to making such observations upon the customs and usages of that body, in connection with all departments of their work, as he thought might be rendered subservient in suggesting lessons of instruction and improvement to those whom he represented.

In regard to fundamental principles, of course, there was no occasion that he should institute any very rigid comparison. There is no ground for any. We cannot avoid observing, however, that in an incidental remark to which we just now alluded a thought is

elicited that may be of use to some in both countries. The remark relates to Mr. Wesley's poll deed as a basis of the powers and prerogatives of the English Conference, and, consequently, an illustration of *what is original Wesleyan Methodism*, according to his own definition of it. That this subject may be placed fully before our readers, most of whom, being identified in all their feelings and interests with Wesleyan Methodism, are concerned to understand the principles it involves, we will quote the section relating to it entire.

"The basis of the powers of the Conference, in all questions of this nature, is a poll deed, executed by Mr. Wesley, February 28, 1784, and enrolled in the high court of chancery on the 9th of March, 1784; by which he gave legal existence to the Methodist Conference, which, by that instrument, is always to consist of one hundred, the vacancies being filled annually in the manner prescribed by the deed. By this deed, also, the power of appointing preachers and expounders of God's word to occupy the chapels, which before had belonged to Mr. Wesley, was granted and secured to the Conference; and, in addition, that the Methodist chapels might never be perverted from their original design, in the trust deeds of all the chapels a clause is inserted, in which reference is made to this poll deed of Mr. Wesley's, and also to the first four volumes of Mr. Wesley's Sermons, and to his Notes on the New Testament; and it is declared that 'no person or persons whatsoever shall be permitted to preach or expound God's Holy Word in the said chapel who shall maintain any doctrine contrary to what is found in these works.' By the decision of the chancellor, Mr. Wesley's deed is confirmed and established, and the Conference is recognized as a legal body; and all their constitutional acts, therefore, are sanctioned by the law of the land. Hence their trust deeds, with all their provisions, are sanctioned; thus the unity of the body is secured, a uniformity of doctrine is established, and the power to maintain and enforce moral discipline in the church is confirmed to the Conference and their official organs and members. The Wesleyan Methodists, therefore, may claim Mr. Wesley's poll deed as their *Magna Charta*, and the chancellor's decision as confirming to them all the rights and immunities therein contemplated. This is one among many evidences of the reach of Mr. Wesley's mind, and of his remarkable adaptation to and fitness for the office of a reformer, and of a founder of a religious society of extraordinary comprehension and efficiency."

This exhibit of the character and legal bearing of Mr. Wesley's poll deed, the corresponding deeds of the chapels, and the chancellor's decision, strikes us as important—we know not how it may appear to others—on account of its furnishing a determinate and final answer to the question, What are the cardinal doctrines and fundamental moral principles of Wesleyan Methodism? No answer to this question can be relied on with more safety than that furnished by Mr. Wesley himself. And here we have it as both the Conference and the chancellor appear to have understood it. The elements of the doctrines and ethics of primitive Methodism, then, are to be found in the works herein alluded to; and every thing claimed to be essentially *Wesleyan*, in regard to faith or morals, must be interpreted by these standard productions. It is not to be inferred, however, that other parts of the writings of this great man are to be less

esteemed, or the sentiments they contain less cordially adopted and firmly adhered to by his followers, according as they shall appear to agree with the word of God, and correspond with these principal works. But as it seemed necessary, in order to perpetuate the identity of Methodism as he gave it to the societies which he was instrumental in raising up, that some standard of faith and morals should be referred to which might always serve for a test to whatever should afterward claim to be essentially part and parcel of the original; and as this portion of his numerous productions has been selected for that purpose, we have his authority for giving them the pre-eminence in this respect.

The necessity of such an established standard of doctrine and morals, to be preserved as a standard in all ages, will naturally suggest itself to the mind of every reflecting person, from the fact, that a confused and imperfect understanding of the subject renders people exceedingly liable to be drawn into much unprofitable controversy, as destructive to their own spiritual enjoyment as it is to the peace and prosperity of the church. When restless individuals, ambitious for personal distinction, or impatient of moral restraint, thrust themselves forward to obtain an ascendancy by gaining partisans to their particular views and measures, nothing is of more importance to them than to be able by any means to press into their service the opinions of men held in high veneration by the people they aim to influence in their favor. Hence in all the factions which have disturbed the quiet of the Wesleyan Connection, on both sides of the Atlantic, efforts have been made to persuade the credulous that the whole body have sadly departed from *original Methodism*; and the reform or revolution, as the case may be, proposed by the leaders of the party, is always represented as aiming at restoring first principles. To give efficacy to this kind of agitating process, the opinions of Mr. Wesley, as explained by the party, in whatever connection they are found, are held up as constituting the framework of the structure of Methodism; and a single isolated sentence, irrespective of the design of the author in writing it, is sometimes adopted and incessantly appealed to for this purpose. This, it must be evident, is calculated most effectually to deceive and mislead persons of little experience and knowledge in such matters. Mr. Wesley, like other great men, wrote on many subjects, such as philosophy, politics, &c. He wrote, too, tracts and essays on matters of local interest. And often, from the impulse of the moment, recorded his views and feelings respecting such topics as were introduced by individuals with whom he happened to come in contact. But it is unreasonable to suppose that on all these occasions he considered himself as writing institutes for his societies. Much that he has written has obviously little or no connection with elementary Methodism, and from the very nature of the subjects which he treated, cannot have. It would therefore be absurd to quote opinions expressed by him in these essays as exhibiting the fundamental principles of Methodism. We do not say that his miscellaneous productions contain any thing, when fairly construed, at variance with those standard works alluded to above. But our position is, if any thing quoted from his other works have the appearance of conflicting with these, and with the specific articles of faith and general rules, involving the terms of membership

in the church which bears his name, it must be expounded by *these*, and not the contrary; though it is believed that few things will be found in all Mr. Wesley's miscellaneous writings, which, if impartially examined and legitimately interpreted, have even the *appearance* of conflicting with what he has put forth as a summary of his doctrinal views and moral sentiments. But however this may be, (and it does not come within our design to inquire respecting it now,) the standard of primitive Methodism, in so far as it was the aim of Mr. Wesley to provide for perpetuating its identity by means of the ministry and institutions raised up through his instrumentality, is to be found in the works we have named, with the articles of faith and principles of church order forming the basis upon which the Wesleyan Conference in England, and the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, were severally organized.

In extending our remarks on this topic we have in view another aspect of the subject. It is its legal bearing. It appears that in England this has been fully tested. It occurs to us, however it may appear to others, that the principles on which a decision was obtained in favor of the Wesleyan Conference, which secured to them the chapels for the use and benefit of those, and those only, who continue in connection with that body, are of universal application, at least wherever similar views of law and equity prevail. But whether we be right or wrong in our views, there is the same necessity that the subject, in all its aspects and bearings, should be understood in this country as in England, since there is the same liability to difficulty from similar causes. And the matter is certainly worth a passing thought. Not to be unnecessarily tedious where we should be brief, we will condense our remarks as much as possible. For the sake of unity in amplifying our thoughts we will limit the reference to the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States.

It is obvious to all that the design of Mr. Wesley in sending preachers to America, and in subsequently organizing a church here, was to introduce and perpetuate in this country that form of Christianity called Methodism, with all its distinctive and fundamental peculiarities, and nothing else. The idea of its obtaining root, and afterward becoming so vitiated and changed as to be something else directly opposed to its original self, would have been sufficient to deter him from taking a single step in this work. To him, then, and all who co-operated with him in this enterprise, it must have been a primary consideration so to organize the church, and settle all the institutions designed to promote its objects, that they should be incapable of being employed for another or contrary purpose.

The design of the institutions of the Methodist Episcopal Church is exceedingly simple and explicit. It is to spread Scriptural holiness through the land.

In the organization of the church which was established in Mr. Wesley's day, and at the head of which he stood for a time as a general superintendent, the powers and prerogatives of its different judicatories, as well as the duties and responsibilities of its officers, were so arranged and adjusted as to farther the grand object in the best possible way; while at the same time care was taken to guard against the possibility of any so using their authority as to invade the rights of a single member, or employ its institutions for any purpose adverse to Methodism.

To come directly to the point we have in view, the houses of worship erected for the accommodation of the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church are presumed to be intended for the sole purpose of promoting the cause of Christianity in that form in which they of choice have received it; as those who contribute for the building of such houses are supposed to understand the object, and to give from a desire to promote it. Whether, then, those who afterward occupy those houses think Methodism the best system of religion or not—whether they adhere to the principles and practice of their benefactors, or address themselves to the work of innovation and reform—it does not alter the case. The houses were erected for the support and advancement of *Methodism*, as presumed to be understood by those who built them; and they cannot be wrested from such as continue in the principles and practice of Methodism so understood, to be used for the inculcation of opinions and the promotion of measures adverse to its standard of doctrines and instituted authorities by even a majority of the society and congregation worshiping in them. This seems to be the principle upon which the case referred to by Dr. Fisk, in regard to the British Conference, was decided in favor of the conference.

In any case of dispute respecting the proprietorship of a house of worship erected for the use of the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, where a majority of the society worshiping in it become factious, and array themselves against the instituted authorities of the church, the issue of a litigation would turn, if the principle in question be a correct one and generally applicable, upon this point, which party adhere to the true principles and authorized practices and usages of *Methodism*? Which have a majority of votes, would, we conceive, have no weight in deciding the matter.

The sources of evidence in such a case would be, the approved doctrines and discipline of the church; authorized and acknowledged usages, not of that individual society, but of the whole body; and the acts of the General Conference made in conformity to the powers and prerogatives with which that judicatory is invested by the Discipline. The party showing that they had acted in conformity to these would secure the premises. That shown to have assumed an antagonist position, and adopted principles or measures hostile to either of these, would be ejected. Local majorities, or fiscal officers, obtained by local majorities, would not be taken into the account. This, we say, so far as we can see, would be the legitimate operation of the principle in question.

How far the records of jurisprudence throughout this country will go to show a correspondence between this principle and the practice of the courts on this subject, we are not prepared to say. But within the range of our own experience and observation the principle has been admitted as a rule of procedure. We have witnessed its application in a few instances, and traced its recognition in others. It is evidently the basis of that most lucid opinion given by the chief justice of Upper Canada, on the chapel question, lately litigated in that province, as it appeared not long since in our public journals. It pervaded the decision by which the Unitarians in London were, some three or four years ago, dispossessed of a legacy bequeathed by a wealthy English lady for the promotion of *evangelical* godliness. It was plainly recognized in the decision lately made in this

country upon the conflicting claims between the Hicksite and the Orthodox Quakers. And at this moment, if we are correctly informed, there is pending between these parties a controversy in law, the issue of which is suspended upon evidence of what are the genuine opinions of the primitive Quakers; and for this evidence reference is had to the records of the London yearly meeting, it being by common consent admitted that the works which that body have officially sanctioned, and they only, are to be appealed to for the purpose of settling this question.

One conclusion to which we are brought by this train of reflections is, that as the writings of Mr. Wesley referred to in the chapel deeds in England are made the standard of Wesleyan Methodism to the English Connection, in so far as doctrines and morals are concerned, they are to be received as such by all the branches of the Wesleyan family.

The use of this deduction is, that it furnishes a rule by which to settle controversies which sometimes occur respecting what are the fundamental principles of primitive Methodism, in the manner we have already noticed. When men put forth their dogmas in the name of the venerable Wesley, it behooves them to show the authority on which they do so. If they quote from these standard works, and make it manifest that what they quote, by a fair and unsophisticated interpretation of it, sustains, according to the evident intention of the writer, the positions they assume, the question is settled. They show, at least, that they are within the pale of Wesleyan Methodism. But if they quote from his other miscellaneous writings, which have never been officially wrought into the framework of the articles of faith, moral code, or systems of ecclesiastical order and government, bearing the sanction of his name, the evidence is not sufficient. It does not answer the purpose for which it is adduced. It may, indeed, present the views of the writer on the subject of which he was treating at the time he used it, and be so far entitled to respect. It may also serve to amplify a branch of the doctrines recognized in those theological productions to which he has been pleased to attach more particular weight and importance, and thus have their value in imparting instruction and promoting edification. It is possible, too, that it may be barely an expression of his private opinions, hastily formed, and in which he could not expect all even of his own widely extended flock to agree with him. But to make even his opinions *essentially Methodism*, and so to use them as to affect the claims of those who profess it as a system of religion, it is incumbent, as we humbly conceive, to show that the opinions advanced for such a purpose are clearly and unequivocally contained in those of his works which have, by the concurrence of himself and his followers, been officially recognized as constituting the basis of the general structure of that system. Were an eye always had to this distinction, which we cannot but consider one of importance, fewer would be influenced by an incessant cry of "Wesleyan Methodism," to enlist in enterprises whose only tendency is to destroy what we would charitably hope they wish to build up.

Another conclusion to which these remarks conduct us affects more particularly the practice of the societies in connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church. What Mr. Wesley's poll deed,

and the British Conference, organized under its provisions, are to the Wesleyan Connection in England, the Discipline and the General Conference are to the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. In the former there can be no *Methodism*—none of the peculiar privileges of the *Wesleyan institutions*—to be enjoyed by any who are separated from the Conference, or arrayed in opposition against it, so long as it acts within the limits of the prescribed charter. The same is true with respect to American Methodism. It can exist only in connection with, and dependent on, the General Conference, acting under the provisions laid down in the Discipline. And the same principle which secures to the members in England the rightful possession and free use of the churches erected for their benefit, *only* in Connection with the conference, secures the same to the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, while they are in connection with the General Conference, according to the order and economy of the church, *and no longer*; for this plain reason, that the same persons separating from that body, and repudiating its authority, divest the institutions which they assume to control of all *Methodistical validity* which that body alone can give them, and cease of course to be the people for whom the churches were built. Although the views we have here expressed are not the result of a superficial examination of the subject, we had no idea of devoting so much of this article to them when we commenced it. We perceive the subject will admit of much amplification, and it may indeed seem necessary even on the score of illustration; but we must drop it abruptly for want of room. If any consider it out of place, we shall not contend with them about that. In the work we are reviewing, it stands in immediate connection with a notice of a painful schism, characterized, as is common in both countries, by an array of opposition against the constituted authorities of the church, and efforts to turn the societies against them. Among the many things of interest to the cause of Methodism in England, Dr. Fisk has furnished us with the item we have quoted above. As a matter of information barely, it is interesting to all who sympathize in feeling with their English brethren; and on this account it claimed, in common with other things, a passing notice. But we have avowed our conviction, that for the reasons we have stated above, it possesses in our estimation a higher degree of importance on account of its bearing upon our own institutions. If in this others differ from us, it is a matter which gives us no uneasiness whatever. No harm can result from a calm and candid investigation of a question, a too imperfect understanding of which has already occasioned no small degree of controversy and evil in the church. And if our hasty remarks, unpremeditated as they were in this place, shall contribute, in any degree, toward exciting enlarged and liberal inquiry on this subject, and preventing unpleasant collisions which, it is to be feared, often occur for want of a more generally correct understanding of it, we shall be satisfied.

On meeting the British Conference, Dr. Fisk was received and treated with much Christian kindness and respect. The following were his reflections, as he has recorded them, on that occasion:—

“Having arrived at the seat of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, one of the most important purely ecclesiastical bodies in this or any country; a body, too, to which I had been officially dele-

gated by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, it will be expected, of course, that a small portion of my journal should be devoted to the official doings of this body. To avoid, however, such details as would be at best only interesting to those of the same denomination, I shall touch only upon those points that will serve to show the general constitution and present condition of this very efficient branch of the Christian church; a subject which, to the philosopher and the politician, the observer of man as a social and a religious being, must, in any event, be one of deep interest.

"The most perfect exemplification of this system is in England, for this is the parent stock, and here the system has, in its practical operations, ripened into its greatest maturity and acquired its greatest vigor.

"Methodism in the United States has become more extended than the British Connection, including all their missions, in the ratio of two to one. But the peculiarities of our country, connected with the fact of the more recent establishment of the cause in America, has prevented that practical perfection of the organization that is exhibited in England. The present is the ninety-third Annual Conference of the British Connection; whereas the first Conference in the United States was held in 1773, only sixty-three years since. At that time there were but ten preachers in the connection, and for the ten following years, in consequence of the revolutionary war, there was very little increase comparatively: so that the principal gain of the Methodist cause in the United States has been in a little over half a century."

In concluding his remarks on the British Conference, Dr. Fisk adverts to a question often asked, "What are the points of difference or coincidence between English and American Methodists?" To this he replies:—

"I answer, that in every thing essential they coincide; in doctrine and moral discipline, perfectly; in all the ceremonies and general usages they are the same. The English are more systematic than we are; every thing is in order; every thing is done at the time and in the manner the rule proposes. This is a commendable trait, and is in a great measure the secret of their success. In this respect the inconveniences of a new country have contributed to lead us to relax too much from the rules of our great founder, who left on all the institutions of Methodism the stamp of his *methodical* mind.

"The character of their ministry, intellectual and theological, and, indeed, for general pulpit qualifications, does unquestionably, in the great whole, exceed ours. I do not mean that we have not as many of what would be called superior preachers as they have, but the great body sinks below theirs, and that for very good reasons. Many of our most promising men have been compelled, or, at any rate, induced, for the want of competent support, to leave us and join others; or, what is more common, go into the local ranks and engage in some secular calling. To this, in England, there is no temptation. In addition, their ministers increase faster than their calls for them. The consequence is, they are not obliged, in order to fill up or enlarge their work, to take any but the best; the barely passable they *pass by*, whereas our great call for ministerial

labor leads us to take all who offer that are judged barely passable."

It will be perceived that in the comparison instituted between English and American Methodists, in the paragraphs just quoted, the former are represented as excelling in several respects. To say nothing at present of those remarks in which he throws the balance in the opposite scale, it may not be unprofitable for us carefully to examine such features of their system of operations as can be safely and successfully adopted in our own. That it can be copied in all respects, no one acquainted with the different circumstances in which the two Connections are placed, will pretend. The groundwork of the general system of American Methodism is unquestionably best for this country. And with precision and care in carrying out its principles in all the departments of practice for which it provides, it will naturally acquire more consistency and a higher degree of perfection. But a neglect of first principles, or habitual looseness in the administration of the rules it prescribes, must, in the nature of things, have a deleterious tendency, and result in a derangement of the whole system, if not in a subversion of its high and holy purposes.

True it is, that the extension of our country, the constant changes which are going on in the state of society by removals from one section to another, the institution of new circuits in following the tide of emigration, and the necessary changes in circuits and districts in the older portions of the work, all which tend to keep societies, quarterly meeting conferences, &c., in a perpetually unsettled condition, form a serious obstacle against the establishment of that order and uniformity in practice which characterize the operations of our British brethren. But we cannot resist the conviction that there are other causes which contribute very much to the same effect. Among these we reckon first a prevailing disposition to cut up districts and circuits, and to establish stations, ~~beyond~~ what the nature of the case requires. The English Connection have, properly speaking, no stations. All their work is arranged into convenient circuits, each having a regular superintendent, with a suitable number of associate laborers, and all the regular institutions necessary to carry on their work in form and order. These are very seldom changed, so that their judicatories, records, &c., become permanent; and those accustomed to act together acquire the habit of doing their business with greater uniformity and exactness. On the contrary, there is a prevailing disposition among American Methodists, in some parts at least, to cut up the work by narrowing down the circuits as much as possible, and establishing stations wherever the people will furnish only a meager support to a preacher, irrespective of the injury it may do to the circuits from which they are taken. Thus every thing is constantly in a state of fluctuation. In many places the quarterly meeting conferences are constituted of very few members, and but a small portion of them at all experienced in the business connected with these important judicatories of the church. While things remain in this unsettled condition, we cannot expect even an approximation to that systematic order in conducting our affairs which is so desirable, not to say necessary, for preserving peace and promoting prosperity in the church.

Another evil resulting from this very cause is a too rapid increase

of the traveling ministry. We believe, indeed, that extremes are possible in this as in almost every other matter. We may lay out our work on too large a scale, and require so much of the preachers that it may not be in their power to cultivate their several fields as they ought. But it is equally certain that we may make the sphere of their action too limited. It strikes us as unreasonable that the entire services of a preacher should be required for from fifty to two hundred members, and they possibly all within a single township, when fifteen or twenty years ago there was twice that average number on the circuits, throughout our work, and these extended over some dozen or fifteen towns. This, it appears to us, is carrying matters to extremes; and whatever may be offered in justification of it, there is little, we believe, in the economy of the Methodist itinerancy which will go to favor it. It may tend to order of a certain kind—to Congregational order for example—but not, if we judge correctly, to Methodistical order. There is still another item in this business which merits attention. It is this. In the excess of dividing circuits and instituting stations, and the necessary increase of preachers to fill up the work, it naturally occurs that many are called to take the *charge*, and administer the discipline, while yet too young and inexperienced to have a clear and comprehensive knowledge of the rules they are called to administer. Besides this, the limited means of support given to the preachers, occasioned in part by narrowing down the work, compels many to locate when they are best qualified for efficient service in the itinerant work. In England this is not the case. The competent and sure support given to their traveling preachers removes all ground of complaint, and consequently lays the preachers under a sort of obligation to continue in the field, which obligation the Conference finds it both consistent and practicable to enforce. By consequence the British Conference has in it, to balance its decisions and regulate its transactions, an amount of experience and practical intelligence which keeps every thing in subjection to instituted order and established usages. But the numerous locations and extensive calls for preachers, occasioned by dividing the work, &c., among us, tend to render our conferences of a different description. In most of them majorities are made up of preachers of comparatively short standing in the ministry. In this state of things uniformity and order are slowly attained, even with the greatest care to avoid or overrule the hindrances we have named; and without this, the prospect is still more discouraging.

We may trace to the same general causes the comparative absence of another excellence which Dr. Fisk noticed in the British Methodists. We mean the deference paid to age and office. "I was pleased," says Dr. Fisk, "at the deference paid to seniority and to office in the British Wesleyan Conference; and not only here, but in all the social and domestic relations in this country. Honesty and candor oblige me to say it is the contrast of what we see in America; and it is but candid to acknowledge that this difference is doubtless owing, in a great measure, to the difference in the influence of the political institutions of each country respectively upon social and domestic habits." This is no doubt true to some extent. But we are persuaded that the circumstances we have named above, and especially the causes of the numerous locations of the more

aged preachers and the premature investment of the younger ones with all the prerogatives and functions of ruling ministers, has more influence in this matter than any thing else. Were these causes removed, as, indeed, they may be if the people will, and our venerable men retained in the itinerant ranks to mingle with their younger brethren in their work, and aid them by their counsels, a respectful regard would be paid to age and to office in the church, as well in America as in England.

With respect to the means of improving the ministry by the institution of a theological school, we know not how it may answer for our British brethren, controlling it, as they may, by an individual incorporated conference; but it possesses nothing, in our estimation, which we can borrow or in any way improve for our benefit in this country. We have ever been favorable to raising the standard of education in the church, by the establishment of literary institutions of the higher order under the direction and control of one or more of the annual conferences. But we believe that no better system of *theological instruction* can be devised for us than that which has been recommended by the General Conference, and is now in general practice—none, certainly, liable to less abuse, or better calculated to preserve the unity of the body in doctrine as well as in discipline. It is calculated to keep the theology of the church under the control of the whole united body, where it should be kept, and not to subject it to the capricious management of a few professors, who may shape it to suit their own fitful fancies.

In conducting their financial operations, the British Conference, according to Dr. Fisk, are far in advance of us. They have every thing reduced to the most perfect system. And the people have so habitually accustomed themselves to the operations of this system, that they seem prepared to sustain it and carry out its objects, without the least indication of reluctance or dissatisfaction. In the perfection of their system, and the harmonious operation of all its parts, is to be found the reason of their being able to keep up all the branches of their extensive work with so much apparent ease. In reference to this subject Dr. Fisk says:—

“The most important parts of their business are arranged and prepared in committees that are appointed the year before, and meet several days before the session of the Conference for that purpose. At most of these committees, lay members are invited to be present to take part in the deliberations, and especially to assist in the arrangement of the financial concerns of the church.

“As this part of the system is a beautiful feature in the economy of Methodism, I will give some of its general features.

“Although the financial resources are altogether from the voluntary offerings of the people, yet they inculcate the principle that every one ought to do something; and the least that any one should do who is not absolutely a pauper is reckoned at a penny a week, and in addition one shilling at each quarterly renewal of the ticket of membership. All will do this much, it is calculated, and the money thus collected nearly meets the current expenses of the societies. But, in addition to this, there are several other sources of income, which are called *funds*; not that there is any money funded which is made available for the church, but moneys collected for specific objects are called the funds for those objects respectively:

such as the *school fund*; the *contingent fund*; the *chapel fund*; the *children's fund*; the *preachers' auxiliary fund*; the *missionary fund*," &c. A particular explanation of these several funds, and of the manner of raising them, which occupies a number of pages in the work before us, is worth the attention of all in this country who are concerned in supporting religious and benevolent institutions on the voluntary principle, and especially the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

But we must bring these remarks to a close. It will not be inferred from what we have said, that Dr. Fisk saw nothing in England, or among English Methodists, which he did not approve. To suppose he did not, would be to ascribe to them a degree of perfection in their social order and general conduct which falls not to the lot of man in the present state of the world. There are those, we know, in whose estimation this circumstance will form an insuperable objection to the work. In all matters appertaining to the institutions, manners, and customs of their country, they are influenced more by feeling than by judgment. Their prepossessions are strong and ardent; and they are accustomed to take things in the aggregate, and to applaud or censure without discrimination. Such persons will never be pleased with a faithful detail of facts—a true picture of the state of society—in any country. Where they have located their antipathies, there they can see nothing good or praiseworthy. And, on the contrary, in every thing connected with their own country—the institutions and customs consecrated in their feelings by a thousand associations—they can see nothing wrong. Under the influence of such feelings, they are not prepared to examine with candor a correct delineation of the state of society in any community. Writers who study most to flatter their prejudices are sure to please them best. They cannot, in fact, be pleased in any other way. A fancy picture—the model of perfection and beauty—on the one hand, and caricature on the other, fill their eye and gratify their taste completely; and nothing else will do it. Such persons—and there are some, though, for the honor of human nature, we hope not many of this description among us)—will find authors who will please them much better than Dr. Fisk. He neither approves nor condemns without discrimination. And this we deem one of the chief excellences of his work. Nor can we doubt that it will be so considered by the candid of all classes. He found, indeed, some things in England, as well as elsewhere, which he could not approve; and he was too honest to seem to justify what his judgment condemned. On the contrary, he found much, very much, to admire and applaud; and he was equally prompt in recording with expressions of high approbation those virtues and excellences which give character to the entire picture. As a whole, therefore, we hesitate not to believe that Dr. Fisk's Travels will be received, by all candid and intelligent readers, as the first work of its kind. Such we deem it to be; and with this view of it we take great pleasure in recommending it to the reading public.

We do not, indeed, pretend that the volume before us is faultless. There are in it some errors and mistakes—one or two of which have been corrected by the author through the public prints. But the only wonder is, that there are not more. To collect and arrange such a vast amount of matter in so short a time, and that, too, while

traveling from place to place in a feeble state of health, was a work which no person destitute of Dr. Fisk's practical skill and ready tact could have accomplished. And few under similar circumstances would have prepared and furnished it to the public so speedily, with as few errors and mistakes as it contains.

For the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review.

ART. IX.—DEFENCE OF THE EXISTENCE AND FALL OF SATAN
AND HIS ANGELS.

B Y J. H. YOUNG.

IN the January number, for 1838, of the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review, a communication was published on "the existence and fall of Satan and his angels," in which a new theory on the mysterious doctrine of evil spirits, and angelic beings in general, was advanced and supported by Scripture and reason, upon which it professes to be founded, by the author of this brief defence. It is easily perceptible from the notices of that article in different religious papers, and from a short review in the July number of this periodical, that one object in writing it has already been partially gained—that object was *discussion*. But it has not been discussed by all who have written about it with that Christian candor which was solicited for it, nor yet in that rational and Scriptural manner demanded by the subject.

While it has been *favorably* noticed by some as agreeing better with reason and the word of God than the old system, it has been *ridiculed* by others, who perhaps suppose that nothing is correct but the opinions of their ancestors; and it has again been considered by a third class as a mere *speculation*. I shall confine my remarks at present principally to the "calm review" of the Methodist Quarterly; but I cannot consistently overlook the observations of an editor of another religious journal.

This brother appears to think the *introduction* entirely *too long*, and altogether unconnected with the "twelve propositions." Some minds are too contracted to take in the *whole of a subject*, and they cannot readily perceive the relation one part sustains to another. If this editor had observed the *heading* of the article upon which he animadverts, he would at once have seen that *something* was necessary, in *some part* of the piece, on the *existence* of Satan, because *that* was a part of the *title*. And in writing on the general doctrine of fallen angels, could any thing more suitable be selected, as an introduction, than the importance of crediting their existence, and the foundation upon which that belief should rest, namely, upon the word of God?

As to that part of the new scheme with which he wishes to amuse himself and his readers, and which was only given as a bare supposition, it will be sufficient to remark, that such questions have engaged the attention of wiser men than the author, or even the intelligent editor of the paper alluded to.

With the "calm review" in the last number of the Magazine, the writer of this defence is considerably disappointed; and if the *length* of the introduction complained of by the above editor is an objec-

tion to the new system, it will lie with greater force against the review, because *its introduction is half a page longer than the remaining part of the article!*

The reviewer esteems the "twelve propositions" a *speculative* theory, and seems to be seriously concerned for those who deal in such matters. *Speculation* is a word of rather indefinite signification; and the intransitive verb *to speculate* is perhaps materially different, in its proper meaning, from what it is commonly supposed to be. This verb comes from the Latin *specio*, to see; and is thus defined by Mr. Webster: 1. "To meditate, to contemplate, to consider a subject by turning it in the mind and viewing it in its different aspects and relations." It also means to purchase land, or any thing else, with an expectation of selling again at a profit.

Now if brother Comfort, in using this term, refers to the first of these definitions, then it is at once admitted that the new theory is a *speculation*; for the writer *meditated* on it; he *contemplated* it; and he *considered the subject by turning it in his mind and by viewing it in its different aspects and relations*. But if he means by it that it is a mere scheme of the mind, unsupported by reason or Scripture, the writer presumes to think otherwise.

If it is speculation to say that Satan was the inhabitant of a planetary world before he fell; that he was commanded to remain in it a certain length of time as a test of his obedience; and that he voluntarily left it before the end of his probation,—then it is also speculation to affirm that *heaven* was his dwelling place; that he sinned in it, and was cast out of it; for there is not a single word of Scripture to support this view of the subject; while there are several passages that prove, at least inferentially, the contrary doctrine.

All new theories are not idle speculations, and nothing should be discarded merely because it is novel. A celebrated philosopher was once imprisoned for maintaining the true system of the universe. He asserted that the earth revolved around the sun; but the popular and almost universal opinion was, that the sun moved around the earth; and even in prison he put his lips to the key hole, and exclaimed to those who were without, "The earth turns around still!" And until a better theory shall have been discovered than the one lately published, or until stronger arguments can be brought against it than those contained in the "calm review," many will believe that system still: notwithstanding the ridicule of some, and the cry of speculation by others.

The only passage of Scripture the review ventures against the distinctive features of the "twelve propositions," is John viii, 44. Let us quote the part he alludes to: "He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." "He abode not in the truth," brother C. thinks may be taken as the cause of his fall, just as reasonably as his leaving his own habitation. He therefore asks, "Why may we not as well explain Jude by what our Saviour and Peter have said, as to explain *them* by him?" For a very good reason. Christ refers to the *fall of man* and the conduct of Satan in *that transaction*; while Jude alludes to the conduct of this enemy in *his own fall*. This will presently appear.

If the Saviour in this verse speaks of Satan's downfall, why may
VOL. IX.—Oct., 1838. 59

we not understand him to teach that he was cast out of heaven *for committing murder*, as well as that he was thus punished for not abiding in the truth? To give the verse this interpretation, then, and if the allusion is to his own fall, it is as rational as any other. Satan first was guilty of murder, and then of leaving the truth, and for this he had to forsake his habitation!

But the literal signification of the Greek word *ἀνθρόποκτόνος*, which means properly a *man-killer*, will prove clearly that Christ is speaking of the fall of our first parents through the agency of the old serpent, by which *death* was brought upon them and all their offspring; and by which, especially, many have suffered death for righteousness' sake in the work of persecution against the followers of Jesus Christ. The Jews, in the chapter in question, were seeking the *life* of their Redeemer; and in the conversation they had with him at the time uttered several *gross falsehoods*. They said they had never been in bondage to any man; when they not only were slaves to the world, the flesh, and the devil, and several times had been captives to other nations, but they were likewise, at the very time in which they were speaking, under the jurisdiction of the Roman government. See also verses 39-43. These things (murder and lying) Christ charges home upon them, and therefore says, "Ye are of your father the devil." "He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth." He tempted *Eve* in the garden to partake of the forbidden fruit, through which *death* came into the world; and he instigated *Cain* in the *first actual murder* that was ever perpetrated. In that temptation he abode not in the truth; or, in other words, *he told a lie* to accomplish his object; he assured his victim, among other things that were not so, that "she should *not surely die*." And in that murder, Cain, who was the mere instrument of the devil, as every man is who maliciously takes away the life of his fellow-creature, pursued the same course; for he told the Lord that he knew not where his brother was, when he knew it at the same time.

But that this is the true meaning of this text will appear from the reason given by Christ why Satan abode not in the truth, "*because there is no truth in him.*" Now to say that Satan continued not in the original condition of angels, whether they were in heaven or somewhere else, and to adduce, as a reason of this, his present moral deformity, is no reasoning at all. It proves, indeed, that he is a devil now; but it can never prove that he ever was in heaven, nor even that he was once holy. This may be the *inference*, but where is the *positive proof*? And to say that Satan abode not in the truth, *because* there is no truth in him, is to intimate that he was morally bad when he left the truth; but if *that* was his *first sin*, it was *that* which *first* corrupted his nature.

Now apply this part of the text to his temptation in Eden, and all will be natural and easy. Satan committed murder because he is a murderer; he told a lie because there is no truth in him. He is evil, only evil, and that continually. I conclude, therefore, that the most consistent and rational interpretation of this disputed text is that which refers the whole to the conduct of Satan after the creation of man.

This review, then, which is little besides a series of profitable moral reflections, very creditable to the heart that suggested them, and

equally apropos to the *new* as to the *old* system, leaves the "twelve propositions" just where it found them; no Scripture against them, but some passages and much reason in their favor. It is a very flimsy objection to this theory to say, with brother Comfort, in the close of his article, "that it necessarily involves, as its counterpart, the doctrine, that there was a time since their creation when the holy angels were not the denizens of the kingdom of heaven as they now are." It certainly does, as every child could have seen. But what then? "Why, there is *no proof* of this." And there is none to establish the contrary opinion. But the circumstantial evidence is plainly on the side of the new system. The angels are even now not always in heaven, unless they are omnipresent, which is an absurdity; for many of them are ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation, and consequently, at least occasionally, dwell with the children of men. Yet no person pretends to adduce this fact as a reason why heaven is not their dwelling place at present. *That is now their home*; but they are permitted to leave it on errands of mercy to visit other worlds in the regions of space inhabited by intelligent beings. A different part of the universe was originally their place of probationary residence; but having been faithful, according to the commandment of their Maker, they were taken from it to stand in his presence, and be his messengers for good in the extensive plans of benevolence which he devises by his wisdom and executes by his authority, through their agency, in the various provinces of his empire.

With these remarks I submit it to the farther consideration of an intelligent, scientific, and Bible-reading public; well prepared to bear its fate if it should go down to oblivion, and thankful to God if I shall have succeeded, in the least degree, in removing difficulties from any mind, and in throwing light on the mysterious doctrine of evil spirits.

Harrisonburg, Va., August 7, 1838.

ART. X.—SYSTEM OF EDUCATION IN PRUSSIA.

A WRITER in the *Constitution*, a respectable periodical published in Middletown, Conn., has given the following account of the system of popular instruction in Prussia:—

The universities belong to the state alone; secondary instruction pertains to the provinces; primary instruction belongs chiefly to the department and to the parish.

Every parish is required by law to have a school. It is one part of the office of the pastor or curate to inspect this school. He is assisted by a committee of some of the most considerable persons in the parish, who are called the committee of superintendence and management.

In the city parishes, where there are many schools and establishments for primary instruction of a higher order than the country schools, the magistrates form a superior committee, and as such preside over the different schools with their several committees, and

form them into one harmonious system. This superior committee is called the school commission.

In the chief town of every circle there is another inspector, whose authority extends to all the schools of the circle, and who corresponds with the local inspectors and committees, under the title of inspector of schools for the circle. He is usually a clergyman, and in the Catholic circles the office is committed to the dean.

In Prussia, as well as in the rest of Germany, the first two degrees of authority in primary instruction are committed to the clergy; but above these degrees ecclesiastical influence ends, and the influence of the civil power is introduced. The inspector of schools for the circle corresponds with the regency of every department through the medium of the president of the regency. This regency includes several counselors, who are charged with different duties, and, among others, there is a special counselor for the primary schools, called school counselor. He receives a salary as well as the rest of his colleagues. He is the medium of connection between the public instruction and the ordinary civil administration of the province. He is nominated on the presentation of the minister of public instruction; and as soon as he is nominated he forms a part of the council of regency in his character of school counselor, and thus becomes responsible to the minister of the interior. He makes reports to the council, whose decisions are established by the majority. He inspects the schools, quickens and keeps alive the zeal of the school inspectors, school committees, and school masters. All the correspondence of the parish inspectors, and the superior inspectors, is addressed to him. He conducts the correspondence relative to schools in the name of the regency, and also, through the medium of the president, with the provincial consistories and the school board, as well as with the minister of public instruction. In short, the school counselor is the true director of primary instruction in each regency.

The double character of primary instruction, as parochial and departmental, is represented by the school counselor, who has a seat in the council of the department, and is responsible both to the ministry of the interior and to that of public instruction. All secondary instruction is under the care of the school-board, which forms a part of the provincial consistory, and is nominated by the minister of public instruction. Higher instruction in the universities is directed by the royal commissary, who acts under the immediate authority of the minister. Thus nothing eludes the power and observation of the minister, and, at the same time, sufficient liberty of action is allowed to the several departments of public instruction. The universities elect their own officers. The school-board proposes, and superintends the professors of gymnasia, and examines all the more important points of primary instruction. The council of regency, on the report of the school counselor, and in pursuance of the correspondence of the inspectors and committees, decide on most subjects pertaining to the lower stage of instruction. The minister, of course, does not enter into the details of popular instruction, but he is thoroughly informed as to results, and directs every thing by instructions emanating from him as a centre, and giving a national unity to the system. He does not interfere minutely with secondary instruction; but nothing is done without his

sanction, which is never given without full and accurate reports.—The same remark is applicable to the universities. They govern themselves, it is true, but by fixed laws. The professors elect their deans and their rectors, and are nominated themselves by the minister. The end of the entire organization of public instruction in Prussia is to leave details to the local powers, and to reserve to the minister and his council the direction and general impulse of the system.

Dr. Fisk, in his *Travels*, notices the subject of education in Prussia in the following terms:—

1. One of the features of education in Prussia, as in France, is, that the superintendency of the schools is made a distinct department of government, with an efficient minister at its head.* He, with his council and subordinate officers, looks after the whole system. He not only takes care of the funds and of their distribution, but he sees that well-qualified teachers are employed, proper textbooks introduced, suitable houses provided, &c. To carry out the system efficiently, the country is divided into provinces, and these into regency circles, and these again into smaller circles, and, finally, the smaller circles into parishes. Each parish *must* have a school. This school is under a parochial committee and inspector, subject to the supervision of the higher councils and of the minister of instruction.

2. Every parent is obliged by law to send his child to school from the age of seven years to fourteen. He can, however, by permission of the committee, take out his child before the age of fourteen, if the pupil shall have gone through the course of primary instruction; and, if the parent is not able to furnish the child with suitable clothing, &c., to attend school, the public furnishes them.

3. Each parish is obliged by law to establish and maintain a primary school.

4. The school houses are *well fitted* and suitably located. A play ground is generally laid out in connection with the school house, and often a garden, orchard, &c.

5. In addition to suitable books and maps, cheap apparatus and collections in natural history are required.

6. Religion is taught in the schools, and where there are different religions a spirit of accommodation is enjoined; and if there is more than one master when the parish is divided in its religious views, the head master is to be of the religion of the majority, and the assistant of that of the minority.†

7. Girls' schools are required, as far as practicable, to be separate from the other sex.

8. In addition to the ordinary branches of a primary education as given in our country, drawing, singing, and the elements of geo-

* Why should not this feature be introduced into the respective states in our country? In Connecticut there is an officer to superintend the school *fund*. But of how little avail is it to have a fund, and to have it well taken care of, unless it is also properly expended?

† It should be recollect that this accommodation is effected where the population is divided between Catholics and Protestants, as is the case in a great part of Prussia. How much easier might this accommodation be effected between different Protestant sects?

metry are required. Agricultural instructions and gymnastic exercises are also insisted on.

9. But that which, more than any thing else, gives character to these schools is the competency of the instructors. To secure this there are forty-two normal schools, where teachers are trained to their profession. They are not only taught *what* to teach, but *how* to teach; and to this end they are required to take a three years' course; at the end of which, if found qualified, they receive a certificate, specifying their qualifications, aptness to teach, &c. As these teachers are educated at the public expense, they are required to pursue the business of teaching where the consistories appoint.—Those who excel are promoted; those who are negligent are fined, and, if they continue unprofitable, they are dismissed. No one is allowed to teach who has not his regular diploma or certificate.

10. Although there seems to be much of the exercise of strong authority in this system, it is nevertheless remarkable that a great portion of the machinery that enters into it is made of the managing committees and councils appointed by the different parishes and circles; so that the business of government, after all, seems to be to form the general plan and exercise a general supervision, while the immediate superintendency falls upon the people immediately concerned. This gives a general interest in the schools, which could not otherwise be secured, and which is indispensable to the success of the plan. So satisfied is the government of the necessity of enlisting the popular feeling in order to secure success, that, when the new provinces on the Rhine were acquired by the arrangement of 1815, the law requiring parents to send their children to school under the sanction of severe penalties was suspended until, by gentler means, a public sentiment could be formed in favor of popular education. In 1825 this law was also put in force in these provinces.

It is supposed that there is now scarcely a child in all the Prussian dominions capable in body and mind of attending and receiving instruction between the ages of seven and fourteen, who is not in a process of primary or higher instruction. In 1831, out of a population of twelve millions, seven hundred and twenty-six thousand, eight hundred and twenty-three, which was the reported population of the entire kingdom, there were attending the public primary schools two millions, twenty-one thousand, four hundred and twenty-one.

In addition to her primary schools and private seminaries, Prussia has one hundred and ten higher schools called *gymnasia*; and, above these, she has six universities, viz., at Berlin, the capital of the kingdom; at Halle, in Saxony; at Bonn, on the Rhine; at Breslau, in Silesia (this is principally under the control of the Catholics); at Konigsberg, in East Prussia; and at Greifswalde, in Pomerania. These universities are generally in a very flourishing condition, and are, as well as the other universities of Germany, supplied, for the most part, with splendid libraries.

ART. XI.—CRITICAL NOTICES.

THE following notices of recent publications we have copied from the American Biblical Repository, a quarterly periodical of distinguished literary merit, published in this city, edited by Dr. A. Peters:

Researches into the Physical History of Mankind. By JAMES COWLES PRICHARD, M. D., F. R. S., M. R. I. A., Corresponding Member of the National Institute of France, Honorary Fellow of King's and Queen's College of Physicians in Ireland, Member of the Royal Academy of Medicine of Paris. Third edition. London, 1836-7. Vols. I. and II. Pp. 376, 373.

Dr. Prichard, the author of the volumes before us, has already made himself favorably known to the literary and scientific world. Besides the former editions of the present work, he has published a Treatise on Insanity, said to be the best work on mental derangement in the English language; a Review of the Doctrine of a Vital Principle; and a learned Analysis of the Egyptian Mythology. The diversities of structure in the human family early engaged his attention, and in 1808 he selected this subject for the argument of a Latin inaugural essay, printed at that time. The same treatise was translated and enlarged in 1813, and under this new form it made the first edition of the present work. After farther and laborious investigation he brought out a second edition in 1826, to which in 1831 he added an able philological essay on the eastern origin of the Celtic nations, proved by a comparison of their dialects with the Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and Teutonic nations. He now presents to the public a third edition. In the words of the author "each edition has been almost entirely written anew: every topic comprised in it has been reconsidered, with the advantage of such additional information as I have been in the interval enabled to acquire."

The physical history or physiognomical ethnography of the human race is a department of knowledge of the most recent date—indeed it owes its origin to an author now living, Professor Blumenbach, of Göttingen. Dr. Prichard had, however, thought deeply upon the subject before the works of Blumenbach fell into his hands, and with these for a foundation it has been presented in a better form and with clearer illustration. The comparative physiology and psychology of the different human races has never before been made the express subject of inquiry.

In the first of these volumes, Dr. Prichard has impartially investigated the question with regard to the unity of the origin of the human races, which he successfully endeavors to decide by analogies drawn from the vegetable and animal world. He takes a stand (in which Lawrence* agrees with him) in opposition to the French philosophers, who openly proclaim, in defiance of the sacred Writ, the diversity of origin of whites, negroes, etc., etc. The degrading theories of Voltaire, Desmoulins, Rudolphi, Bory de St. Vincent, Virey, and Lamarck, are satisfactorily confuted, and the truth of the Mosaic account is fully substantiated.

Researches into the physical ethnography of the African races, with comparative vocabularies of African languages and dialects, are comprised in the second volume of the third edition. The

* Lectures on Physiology, Zoology, and the Natural History of Man. London. 1819.

soundness of his arguments, the clear and philosophical language which he employs, together with his extensive information and unwearyed industry, render Dr. Prichard's work highly instructive, as well as essentially different, and more satisfactory than any other treatise on the same subject. "It would be difficult," says Dr. Wiseman, "for any one in future to treat of the physical history of man without being indebted to Dr. Prichard for a great portion of his materials."^{*}

The work will probably extend to several volumes, as by far the most interesting and the largest portion of the human family is yet left uninvestigated.

Professor Bush's Commentary on Genesis. New-York. 1838.

We have received a few of the first pages of this Commentary. It is much in the form of Mr. Barnes's Notes on the New Testament. We have before, frequently, expressed our high opinion of the value of Mr. Bush's exegetical labors. His remarks exhibit extensive learning, yet modestly and not unnecessarily protruded, and the happy talent of exhibiting perspicuously and briefly the meaning of the sacred writers, while his moral reflections are generally pertinent and striking. It is not a *preaching* commentary, but a thoroughly *exegetical* one, and well adapted both to the learned and the common reader. The theories which are occasionally advanced to account for particular facts are not dogmatically propounded, and serve, on the whole, to give liveliness and interest to the observations. Professor Bush has had extensive opportunities to become thoroughly versed in the great department of Biblical illustration. The pages before us give the rich fruits of that knowledge. The author's mind is too candid and liberal to induce him to wish that others should accord with him on every point, at least until after thorough examination. With many of the notes on the first chapter of Genesis we entirely concur. Respecting the correctness of a few statements we are in doubt. On page 26 it is remarked, that "it is a matter rather of rational inference than of express revelation, that the material universe was *created out of nothing*. Yet it is such an inference as cannot be resisted without doing violence to the fundamental laws of human belief." It appears to us, however, that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews asserts directly, (xi, 2,) that the world was created by God out of nothing. "The things which are seen [i. e., the visible universe] were not made of things which do appear." The *τὸ ἐκ μὴ φανομένων* would be equally conclusive against any pre-existing materials, to whatever geological theory we may be attached. Professor Bush adopts, page 31, with some distinguished geologists, the theory of indefinite days. If the fact adduced by geologists (see Introduction to Buckland's Bridgewater Treatise) be well established, that of the three thousand species of the fossil remains of plants and animals, in the tertiary formation, less than six hundred are identical with living species, while the mass of those that are identical occur in the uppermost members even of the tertiary strata, or, in other words, that the fossil remains do not correspond with the order of the six days' creation, then the theory of indefinite days is unsound and

* Lectures, p. 112.

unnecessary. Bib. Repos., vi, 309: "And for days and years. As the word *for* is here omitted before *years*, though occurring before each of the other terms, the sense of the phrase is undoubtedly 'for days *even* years;' implying that a *day* is often to be taken for a *year*, as is the case in prophetical compilations." We think that it is much more probable that days here means twenty-four hours only, and that there is an ellipsis of ה before שׁוֹשָׁן. The Septuagint has εἰς ἐβιαντούς. Mr. Bush's theory in respect to the topography of Eden is, that it embraced the countries known at present as Cabool, Persia, Armenia, Koordistan, Syria, Arabia, Abyssinia, and Egypt. The Pison is supposed to be the Indus, the Gihon the Nile, and Havilah to be situated on the borders of India. There are, unquestionably, serious difficulties connected with either of the almost innumerable hypotheses on the topography of Eden. Yet the one which assigns the location to Armenia is, we are constrained to believe, the most probable. Some of the other theories assume that the deluge produced greater changes in the earth than seem to have been possible, or at least probable.

The True Intellectual System of the Universe: wherein all the Reason and Philosophy of Atheism is confuted, and its Impossibility demonstrated. Also a Treatise on Immutable Morality; with a Discourse concerning the true notion of the Lord's Supper; and two Sermons on 1 John ii, 3, 4, and 1 Cor. xv, 57. By RALPH CUDWORTH, D. D. *With References to the several Quotations in the Intellectual System, and an Account of the Life and Writings of the Author.* By THOMAS BIRCH, M. A., F. R. S. First American edition. In 2 vols. Andover and New-York. Gould and Newman. 1838. Pp. 804, 756.

Dr. Cudworth was born in 1617, at Aller, in Somersetshire, of which parish his father was rector. He was admitted a pensioner at Emanuel College, Cambridge, at the age of thirteen. His diligence as an academical student was very great; and, in 1639, he took the degree of M. A., and was elected fellow of his college. He became so distinguished as a tutor that the number of his pupils exceeded all precedent. In due time he was presented by his college to the rectory of North Cadbury, in Somersetshire. In 1642 he took the degree of B. D., and was chosen master of Clare Hall, and in the following year was made Regius professor of Hebrew. In 1651 he was made D. D., and in 1654 was chosen master of Christ College, Cambridge. Here, in the bosom of his family, he spent the remainder of his days. In 1678 he published his great work, *The Intellectual System*. The moral as well as mental character of this distinguished scholar stood very high, and he died universally lamented, in 1688, in the 71st year of his age.

The Intellectual System was intended, in the first instance, to be an essay against the doctrine of necessity only; but perceiving that this doctrine was maintained by different individuals on various grounds, he arranged these opinions under three separate heads, which he intended to treat of in three books; but his Intellectual System relates only to the first, viz., "The material Necessity of all things without a God, or absolute Atheism."

Many of our readers will welcome this handsome American edition of this great man's works. The matter which, in the English editions, is contained in two cumbersome quartos or in four octavos, is here comprised in two compact octavos, besides embracing what none of the English editions of the Intellectual System do contain,

the profound and noble treatise on Immutable Morality. This latter has long been out of print. It was published more than forty years after the author's death by Dr. Edward Chandler, bishop of London. It is, in fact, though not professedly, an answer to the writings of Hobbes and of some other infidels whose opinions took away the essential and immutable distinctions between moral right and wrong. In addition to these various treatises, and Dr. Birch's Life of Dr. Cudworth, there is subjoined an analysis of the whole, amounting to nearly one hundred and fifty pages, which forms a very enlightened abstract or abridgment of the various treatises.

Journal of an Exploring Tour beyond the Rocky Mountains, under the direction of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, performed in the years 1835, 1836, and 1837. Containing a description of the geography, geology, climate, and productions; the number, manners, and customs of the natives. With a map of Oregon Territory. By Rev. SAMUEL PARKER. Ithaca, N. Y. 1838. Pp. 371.

Mr. Parker set out upon his journey March 14, 1835, from Ithaca, N. Y. On the 7th of April, with his companion, Dr. Marcus Whitman, he started from St. Louis, Mo., in connection with a caravan of the American Fur Company. On the 10th of August he thus describes the passage through the Rocky Mountains: "Cold winds were felt from the snow-topped mountains to an uncomfortable degree. The passage through these mountains is in a valley, so gradual in the ascent and descent that I should not have known that we were passing them had it not been that as we advanced the atmosphere gradually became cooler, and at length we found the perpetual snows upon our right hand and upon our left, elevated many thousand feet above us—in some places ten thousand. The highest part of these mountains is found by measurement to be eighteen thousand feet above the level of the sea. This valley was not discovered till some years since. Mr. Hunt and his party, more than twenty years ago, went near it, but did not find it, though in search of some favorable passage. It varies in width from five to twenty miles; and, following its course, the distance through the mountains is about eighty miles, or four days' journey. Though there are some elevations and depressions in this valley, yet, comparatively speaking, it is level. There would be no difficulty in the way of constructing a railroad from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean; and, probably, the time may not be very far distant when trips will be made across the continent," etc. This is truly a remarkable discovery. If the facts should prove to be, as they appear from Mr. Parker's description, it is one of the most extraordinary provisions for the convenience of man ever made in the providence of God in the solid framework of the globe. We could have wished that Mr. Parker had gone into full details, and given us an exact account of the whole of this road, excavated by the finger of God.

Mr. Parker pursued his journey among the mountains, stopping at various places, holding consultation with the Indians, and collecting various information, till he reached the mouth of the Columbia River. On the 28th of June, 1836, he embarked for the Sandwich Islands, and in sixteen days anchored in the roads of Honolulu. He reached New-London, Conn., on the 18th of May, 1837.

A great variety of interesting information will be found in the

volume. There is an air of honesty and entire trustworthiness about all the statements. But little, comparatively, is mentioned but what fell under the author's own observation. Mr. Parker seems to have had quite a tact for working his way among Indians, hunters, trappers, half-breeds, and the heterogeneous multitude with whom he came in contact. Many of the Indians seem waiting for the gospel of Christ, and are ardently desiring teachers to be sent to them. The style of the volume is simple and unadorned. There is an occasional use of language which will be called *cant* by some persons. A part of it, as where the author speaks of his own religious feelings, might have been well spared. In one place Mr. Parker makes use of *obliviscited*; we know not in what vocabulary he found the term.

General History of Civilization in Europe, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution. Translated from the French of M. Guizot, Professor of History to La Faculte des Lettres of Paris, and Minister of Public Instruction. First American, from the second English edition. New-York. D. Appleton & Co. 1838. Pp. 346, 12mo.

As our readers already know, M. Guizot stands in the very first rank both of scholars and statesmen. If otherwise uninformed, they must have learned something of his religious views from his remarks before the Protestant Bible Society at Paris, given by our French correspondent in the *Observer* of July 21. A work from such a man must of course be interesting and valuable. The author examines, at considerable length, the influence exerted on civilization by the Christian church in the various forms it has assumed during the period of which he treats. This must add much to the interest with which religious men will peruse it.—*N. Y. Obs.*

ART. XII.—MISCELLANEOUS.

The Old Testament, arranged in historical and chronological order, (on the basis of Lightfoot's Chronicle,) in such a manner that the books, chapters, Psalms, prophecies, &c., &c., may be read as one connected history, in the words of the authorized translation. With notes and copious indexes. By the Rev. Geo. Townsend, M. A., prebendary of Durham, and vicar of Northallerton. Revised, punctuated, divided into paragraphs and parallelisms, Italic words re-examined, a choice and copious selection of references given, &c. By Rev. T. W. Coit, D. D., late president of Transylvania University. Boston: Perkins & Marvin. Philadelphia: H. Perkins. 1838. 8vo., pp. 1212.

The Life and Travels of George Whitefield, a review of which we copied into our last number from the Wesleyan Magazine of London, is advertised by D. Appleton & Co., New-York.

Incidents of Travel in Greece, Turkey, Russia, and Poland. By the author of "Incidents of Travel in Egypt, Arabia Petræa, and the Holy Land." With a map and engravings. In two volumes. New-York. Harper & Brothers. 1838.

A Tale of the Huguenots. Published by John S. Taylor, with an introduction by Rev. F. L. Hawks. This book is said to be a veri-

table narrative of the sufferings of the French refugees, exhibiting their faith and fortitude in a very interesting manner.

Home Education. By the author of *Natural History of Enthusiasm*. Published by J. S. Taylor.

History of the Mission to Orissa, the site of the temple of Jugger-naut. By Amos Sutton. A. A. S. Union. Boston.

Dr. Humphrey has published his letters, originally inserted in the *New-York Observer*, in two volumes.

The following biographical works are constantly on sale by T. Mason and G. Lane, 200 Mulberry-street, New-York:—

Life of J. Wesley, by Rev. R. Watson, 1 vol. 12mo.	\$ 50
" Fletcher, by Rev. Joseph Benson, 1 vol. 12mo.	75
" Dr. Coke, by Rev. S. Drew, 1 vol. 12mo.	75
" Richard Watson, by Rev. T. Jackson, 8vo.	1 75
" Dr. A. Clarke, 3 vols. 8vo., calf extra, English edition	8 00
" 3 vols. in 1	1 50
" Lady Maxwell, 1 vol. 12mo.	1 00
" Mrs. Fletcher	75
" David Stoner	50
" William Bramwell	56
" John Smith	50
" Mary Cooper	50
" Mrs. H. S. Bunting	50
" Hester Ann Rogers	37
" Benjamin Abbott	50
" William Carvooso, a new work	56
" Mrs. Elizabeth Mortimer, do.	50
" Peard Dickinson	38
" M. H. Bingham	37
" Rev. John Valton	38
" Henry Longden	37
Remains of Melville B. Cox	63
Experience of several eminent Methodist Preachers	75

To those who wish to see the excellence of Christianity imbibed and illustrated in the lives and conduct of its able supporters and propagators, the above list of biographies will be prized "above rubies." In the Life of the Wesleys they will become acquainted not only with the history of the most pious men and eminent ministers of Jesus Christ, but also with the rise and progress of Methodism in Europe and America. The others are highly valuable on account of their being less or more connected with the spread of vital godliness, and as exemplifying, in an eminent degree, the pure spirit and temper of the Christian religion.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By N. Bangs, D. D. In two volumes. T. Mason and G. Lane, 200 Mulberry-st., New-York. The first volume of this work is in press, and will soon appear. It will no doubt have an extensive circulation, not only among the members of the church, but others also.

A library of more than thirteen thousand volumes has lately been purchased from the Rev. Dr. Van Ess, of Bavaria, Germany, for the New-York Theological Seminary. This is a splendid collection of theological books, and will be a great acquisition not only to the institution for which it has been procured, but to the literature of the country generally, as it contains many rare works of high value.

